THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XII MAY, 1926 No. 71

EDITORIAL

OUR LORD'S ASCENSION

In a very interesting passage in the essay which concludes *Science Religion and Reality*, the Dean of St. Paul's expresses the opinion that the principal cause of conflict between Christian dogma and modern science arises from the work, not of Darwin, but of Copernicus and Galileo. He asserts that for the Church up to that time "heaven and hell were geographical expressions," and that the verdicts of astronomical science have the effect of creating an acute problem for a faith thus bound up with a now discredited cosmology. He thinks that the Church must choose between three policies. It may condemn modern astronomy as heretical; or it may simply emphasize the symbolical element of all dogma; or it may endeavour to recast "all theological doctrines which rest upon the geocentric theory."

The problem is one which has probably occurred to many, and not least in connection with our Lord's ascension. But before we come to consider that particular issue, it is, perhaps, worth while to point out that of all policies none is easier, and none more mistaken, than to stake out a claim for our own modernity by attributing to the Christians of earlier generations a lack of criticism or of candour of which they were not, in fact, guilty. Two instances will illustrate the point. Readers of Dr. Gore's *Belief in Christ* will remember the "Note on the Ascension" with which it concludes and the striking passage which he quotes from St. Jerome (pp. 320, 321):

It is more surprising (Dr. Gore says) to find Jerome, when he is interpreting "foolish speaking" (on Eph. iii. 5), giving it as an example of such nonsense that Christians dare to say "that heaven is curved like an arch, and that a throne is placed

in heaven, and that God sits upon it, and that, as if He were a commander or judge, the angels stand round to obey His commands and to be sent on different missions." Plainly for Jerome the truth and meaning of the ascension did not depend upon such "nonsense."

The other illustration occurs in Walton's *Lives*, in a letter written by George Herbert to his mother, when she was ill. "Madam," he says, "as the earth is but a point in respect of the heavens, so are earthly troubles compared to heavenly joys." It is arguable, of course, that George Herbert is showing us with what promptitude new knowledge may be turned to pious uses; and certainly that one sentence causes many pages of modern rhapsody about the size of the universe and its bearing on Christian theology to cut a very sorry figure. But in any case, if George Herbert was aware of the Copernican revolution, it had not wrung his withers; while, if he was not aware of it, we may safely say that his theology was already such as had discounted it.

But the problem of the ascension is still a real one, even though it be not as new as the Dean of St. Paul's suggests; and the purpose of these paragraphs is to offer some considerations upon it. The chief of these is that our Lord's ascension is a truth which we have tended to get out of proportion—when judged by the New Testament norm—through laying too much stress upon its historical, and too little on its doctrinal, aspect. The reason of this, it is submitted, is the innate tendency of the human mind to let the pictorial dominate over the conceptual; so that the recorded scene of the ascension, which the imagination can, to some extent, visualize, comes to occupy the whole field of thought at the expense of the permanent and practical truths about our Lord contained in the dogma. Certain facts about the presentation of the ascension in the New Testament are very striking, and not often mentioned. It is a striking fact, for example, that—with the possible exception of St. Luke—our Lord's ascension is not narrated in any one of the four Gospels. Nor is it mentioned in that catalogue of crucial events about our Lord which St. Paul introduces as "a kind of primitive *credo*" (to use Meyer's well-found expression) in the 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians. And yet we do not feel either that St. Paul's *credo* or that any one of the Gospels presents an incomplete story—as we should feel, let us say, if any of them were without record of the resurrection. This suggests that for our minds, and for those of the Evangelists and St. Paul, the ascension was a fact somehow of a different order from the resurrection.

If we are to try to grasp this difference more closely, it is probably St. John who will help us most; for it is his Gospel which shows the deepest reflexion on the facts recorded in the life of the incarnate Son. It would be true to say that the ascension is one of the dominating themes in the mind of this Evangelist, and also that he shows us clearly how he thinks of it. It is the going of Jesus to the Father; and it is involved in the resurrection. We may not say, as some have said, that he makes no distinction between the resurrection and the ascension: the word to Mary Magdalene (xx. 17) forbids us to go so far. But we may and must say that the difference between the resurrection and the ascension, as this Evangelist conceived it, was not one that was measurable in time. The risen Lord does not say "I will ascend," but "I ascend"; already, in this period of the appearances, Jesus gives the Spirit and by His inbreathing calls into life the Church to be His new creation; the appearances themselves, with all their mysteriousness of entrances and exits, are those of One who is far advanced on His journey to the Father. For St. John, the ascension is a truth bound up with the resurrection, not as a new fact added to the resurrection, but rather as its interpretation. He knew, no doubt, of that experience of the disciples recorded in Acts, which had brought home to them this truth; but he knew also that the reality of the ascension was something far greater, and in a sense other, than what the disciples saw.

Yet again, St. Luke on his side was right. He too was no stranger to the idea that the ascension was bound up in the resurrection; the emphatic "therefore" in Acts ii. 34 shows as much, as though the connection between them were logical rather than temporal. But St. Luke is right too in choosing to open the Acts as he does. For the ascension was not so much the last chapter of Christ's earthly life as the first chapter in the history of the Church. The importance of that experience as a fact in time was not that it meant a change then in the life of Jesus, but that it meant a change in the mind of the disciples. The process of their training in the resurrection faith was now complete; their last doubts were then set at rest: they knew then a fresh certainty that their Lord had entered into glory and that they must now put to the proof the commission He had given them, and do so in a new and yet even more intimate relation to Himself. Both Evangelists, then, bear the same testimony from different angles. St. Luke, whose profession as a doctor inclined his mind to the concrete and the matter-of-fact, dwells on the salient events in the experience of those who lived through those days: he is always the historian in aim. St. John,

on the other hand, is the theologian; and to bring out the great invisible realities of his theme, he telescopes the events, bringing the resurrection, the ascension, and Pentecost all together, that they may give their message more impressively.

For us to-day it is this message which matters. And first the ascension proclaims that Jesus is with the Father in glory. There is no prayer nor praise nor adoration that man can offer which cannot be properly, directly, and unreservedly offered to our Lord. And, conversely, heaven has become infinitely human, since He is at God's right hand. There is no child that lisps the Saviour's name but enters it. For those who are in Christ it is no distant place, some day to be reached; but rather a series of "mansions" or dwelling places of the soul that every disciple may learn to enter, as he makes progress in the spiritual life. And as he comes to think of heaven more humanly and more simply as all filled with the love of Christ, he knows that it is from that source that the last judgment upon his life must be pronounced.

Yet further, if the ascension means that heaven has become more human for us, it means also that the Church must become more divine. St. Paul is very plain on this point. We Christians, he tells the Ephesians, are already "in the heavenlies"—already part of that spiritual realm where Jesus reigns, and out of the infinite fulness of His authority now gives to the Church His gifts of ministerial grace and order. St. Paul speaks rather of ministry; other writers of the New Testament of priesthood: but the upshot is the same. It is that we must not divorce the great truth of our Lord's heavenly priesthood—as that is unfolded in the Epistle to the Hebrews—from what we learn elsewhere of the heavenly priesthood of the Church. Rather, the Church on earth and beyond the veil is the great instrument through which our Lord exercises His own abiding *sacerdotium*. True, its exercise is not confined to the priestly body any more than the Kingdom is confined to the Church; but in the measure in which the Church is the expression and sacrament of the Kingdom, so its priesthood is the expression and sacrament of Christ's. And this is a thought which must cause every priest to think at once more highly of his own office and more humbly of himself—more highly of his office, because it is Christ's, not his; more humbly of himself, because for a share in such things none is sufficient.

A SYMPOSIUM ON MIRACLE

[THE four papers printed below on various aspects of the problem of miracle were written independently of one another; and none of the writers had seen any of the other papers before he wrote his own. The first two were composed expressly for the present number of *Theology* ; the third was originally written for another purpose, and Professor Webb has kindly allowed it to be included here; while the fourth arose out of an interesting discussion on miracle held a year or two ago at The Yews, Beaconsfield, and deals in its early pages with a particular objection to miracle which was urged with great force and ability by one who was there. It is hoped that the four papers, representing as they do different angles of approach and in some cases differences of opinion, will serve to provide a useful background for the study of the subject, and suggest, if not a common conclusion with regard to the miraculous, at least a common mind as to the factors which have to be considered.—ED.]

THE MIRACULOUS AND THE SUPERNATURAL

THE object of these few remarks will not be to advocate any particular view on the question whether belief in the historical occurrence of " miracles " is or is not of the substance of the Christian Faith. I wish merely to suggest that the question itself cannot be fruitfully discussed until it has received more precise determination by the elimination of a common confusion. The " miraculous " must not be confused, as it often is confused, in current polemic, with the " supernatural," nor the " non-miraculous " with the " merely natural." There may perfectly well be " supernature " when there is no question of what any controversialist would dream of calling " miracle." A couple of examples will make the point clear. What we are to call " supernatural " will, of course, depend on the precise meaning we attach to the word " natural," and thus, since anyone is free to define his terms as he chooses, it will, to some extent, be arbitrary whether a given aspect of things is to be ascribed to " nature " or to " supernature." But in any philosophy which recognizes that the real world is a hierarchized order—and any philosophy which is to do justice to the facts of man's spiritual life must make the recognition—what is everyday fact at a higher level of being (or emergence, if you prefer to say so), will be *super*-natural if your standard of the natural is capability

of being accounted for in terms of lower levels. Thus if by "nature" you mean simply what the physicist, the chemist, and the physiologist between them take as their given reality, the whole life of man as an intelligent and moral being will be properly regarded as *supernature;* it is an order of being which cannot even be described by the categories rightly treated as supreme, for their own purposes, by the special students of "natural" science. This is why serious moralists like T. H. Green make it a point of fundamental importance that no "naturalistic" account of knowledge or moral action can possibly be given without mutilation of the facts. "Nature," as both Green and his opponents used the word, meant the nature of *animals*, and the whole of science and morality are there as witness that man is something very much more than an exceptionally clever animal; the whole specifically human life, relatively to this standard of "nature," is quite properly regarded as something supernatural.

In the language of Christian theologians, "nature" commonly has a different meaning. The standard of the natural no longer excludes the specifically human. "Nature" includes everything to which, as history testifies, man has been able to rise independently of the special approach to the divine mediated through Christ and Christ's Church. From this point of view, such a good life as that described, for example, in Aristotle's *Ethics*, may be called "natural." But if there is a level of moral being beyond this, attainable only in the communion of Christian believers, that life is, with the new definition of "nature," rightly declared to be "supernatural," and to be only possible in virtue of "grace," normally, at any rate, bestowed through special channels. (It is not meant that without the free bounty of God we could be anything at all, since our very existence itself is, in the last resort, a "gift." What is meant is that the man living the life of grace has received a further gift, not normally bestowed on the "gentile," but normally vouchsafed to the Christian.)

There are two points here which I think we need to be clear about. (1) As I have said, our judgment that anything is "supernatural" is relative to the standard we have selected for the "natural." From what we may call the standpoint of God, nothing, I take it, is supernatural, since in all God bestows or withholds, He is displaying His own nature. But from our standpoint, being as we are creatures who can only attain eternal life by a daily dying out of the temporal into the eternal, every fresh step along the road is a step away from what we are to the unknown thing which we shall be; it is a putting-off of "nature" and a putting-on of "supernature."

The secret of all religions is that—

> "Man hath all that Nature hath, but more;
> And in that *more* lie all his hopes of good."

(2) But it is also clear that though the life of daily putting off the "old man" and putting on the "new" is quite properly called a supernatural life, just because it is a life in which we realize our true end as men by becoming something more than "mere man," it need involve, and in most cases does involve, no incident of a kind which would commonly be called "miraculous." When we speak of the life of this or that notable convert from worldliness to God as a "miracle of grace," we are well aware that we are using words improperly. Thus, for example, to make the point still clearer, let us consider the recorded narrative of our Lord's Passion, down to the very moment of His death. Mankind have always felt that here, if anywhere in history, they are face to face with a supreme manifestation of a life which is utterly and wholly supernatural. But in the whole story there is no incident which we could call "miraculous," if we omit the earthquake and the rending of the veil of the temple at the moment of death. (In view of facts familiar in the lives of the saints, we should not be justified in giving the name "miraculous" to our Lord's vision of the Angel, even if it were better authenticated, nor to the consternation which, in one narrative, His bearing is said to have produced in those who apprehended Him. And the Evangelists make no suggestion that the "great darkness" of the three hours was due to any "supernatural" cause.) But which of us would feel that the supernatural quality of the Passion would be affected in any way if it were to be discovered that the earthquake and the rending of the veil were a later importation into the narrative, any more than we now feel the same thing when we learn that there is no very good authority for the incident of the Angel of the Agony? It is the bearing of the sufferer, not the external setting of the incident, which lifts the scene out of the region of "nature." Or, take a second illustration. When Socrates, who might have secured his acquittal by a few words of apology, have evaded a serious sentence, even after conviction, by proposing some moderate penalty for himself, or have escaped at the very last moment by an *évasion* for which all the preparations had been made, and which, as we must remember, would fully have satisfied his opponents, chose to drink the hemlock rather than compromise by a hair's breadth the mission laid on him by God, was this mere "nature" or was it "grace"? I think any man not wedded to an extravagant theory of the exclusive canalizing of "grace" will answer that it was "grace," and that

here, too, we are confronted by the supernatural. But here there has never been the remotest suggestion of a "miracle."

A "miracle" then, as it seems to me, is not simply the same thing as a "supernatural" event or act, and, incidentally, it follows that it would be unjust to accuse the advocates of a "non-miraculous Christianity" of aiming at eliminating the supernatural from their religion and replacing "the work of grace in the heart" by a mere "natural morality." Matthew Arnold, for example, had an easy and, I should say, flippant assurance that "miracles do not happen," but it would be quite false to say that he was blind to the supernatural or that his personal life, as revealed by his diaries, was anything but one of aspiration after renewal by "grace" into the image of the Eternal. The question about miracles is not the question whether there is "supernature," but merely a question about the way in which, as a matter of historical fact, "supernature" reveals itself. The suggestions I am now to offer are not intended to decide even this issue, but they aim at making it a little more precise.

If we reflect on the examples already produced of a supernatural which we do not call "miraculous," it will, I think, become clear that the reason we call the bearing of our Lord before Pilate supernatural, though no element of miracle enters into it, is that the events related, unique as they are in quality, do not involve any shock to our anticipations, founded on "customary experience" of the order of physical happening. But when we speak of a "miracle," part of what we mean is always that we have received such a shock. As a well-known theologian recently said in my hearing, "A miracle is a thing which makes me say *Oh!*" It is *res mirabilis*. (The speaker's point was that Transubstantiation, as defined at Trent, wouldnot be a "miracle." If the "accidents" of the sacramental species changed on consecration, I should be startled, and should say "*Oh!*" very loud indeed, but the whole point of the definition is that they are *not* in any way changed, and I receive no shock.)

I take it this would be readily granted. What is not surprising is not to be called a miracle. It seems to follow that, to be a miracle, an event must not merely have the quality of supernature, it must be an intrusion into the customary sequence of physical and sensible occurrences: a sight, or sound, or smell, or other *sensible* event which is contrary to the "everyday course of things." In strict accuracy, possibly, there might be a need for more careful discrimination. Suppose the shock is not to sense-perception, but to the habits of thought engendered by natural science? To take my friend's own example, admittedly, on the hypothesis of the believer in Transubstantiation, nothing

" out of the ordinary " which our senses reveal happens when the elements are consecrated. But to most men it is an *intellectual* shock to be told that the sensible attributes of the consecrated elements remain, after consecration, attributes which are not the attributes of any substance. The doctrine clearly made Descartes say " *Oh!* " very decidedly, since he made a point of it that it involved a tremendous difficulty only to be got over by substituting his own metaphysics for those of the schools. He apparently thought that, on the received doctrine of corporeal substance, the doctrine involves a real " miracle," though he agreed with my friend in holding that miracle of this kind is objectionable.

However, for practical purposes, one need not resolve this problem. The events which men have in mind in the current controversies are one and all events of the sensible order, and they all involve the element of the unusual, abnormal, and " shocking." But they involve something more. A merely surprising event is not enough to constitute a miracle, or daily life would be full of miracles. The other thing involved is made clear by considering the names regularly given in the New Testament to what we have come to call the " miracles." On the one side they are called τέρατα, *portenta*, a name which insists on their character as startling and disquieting. But they are also called σημεῖα, " signs," or " tokens." They not merely startle, but they indicate or reveal something of the character of that " wholly other " source from which they come. A " miracle " of healing, for example, not only startles the spectators, it reveals several things, the *power* of God its author over the natural order (hence it is a δύναμις, a " mighty work "), His kindness to the sufferer, His real concern for the bodies as well as the souls of His creatures. A mere τέρας which was not also a σημεῖον would not have the value of a " miracle." Hence the doctrine of theologians that only God can work " miracles," though it is not deniable that many agents, and very evil agents, can do things which are startlingly unfamiliar to us. On the other hand, we may see " signs " of God's goodness and power in the most familiar events, in the hues of the flowers of the field, in the provision for the wants of the young ravens, and the like. But we do not call these miracles, because they have not the character of the surprising and startling. They do not " make us say *Oh!*" I suggest then, as a first step to clarification of thought about the miraculous, that we might agree to define a miracle as a *res mirabilis*, a startling or surprising event which is also a sign or indication of the divine character or purpose. In what follows I wish tentatively to suggest a certain further qualification.

It seems to me to follow from such a definition that "miraculous" itself is a relative term. What is startling to one man or one age need not be startling to another, and events may be startling in different degrees to the same man. Hence it should, I think, follow not only that miracles permit of such a classification into major and minor as that of St. Thomas, but also that what is a miracle relatively to one man or age may not be so to another. Many things which must have seemed immensely surprising to our Lord's Galilæan companions may well seem "natural" to us who look out upon the world of physical events with a very different conception of "nature" and the "natural" at the back of our minds. And much which seems to us to-day "out of the order of nature" may wear a different look to our descendants five hundred years hence, if our civilization should survive so long. And again, on the assumption that there are angelic intelligences of various orders, what startles us may seem natural and obvious to an angel, and what startles an angel of a lower order might seem natural to one of a higher order. It would still remain true that the most exalted seraph cannot fathom the Creator; the Creator might to eternity have surprises enough in store for the seraph, but what would surprise me may not be what would surprise the seraph. What to me is at once a σημεῖον and a τέρας might to him be even more a σμηεῖον than it is to me, since he would presumably read the "sign" with a profounder intelligence, but to him it might be no τέρας.

The point I want to make, then, is simply this. There are two, and, as far as I can see, only two, questions we may profitably ask about "miracles" alleged to have attended God's dealings with man throughout history. Is there a definite reason to believe that the events alleged to have happened really occurred? If they did, was the interpretation put on them as "signs" a sound one? Has the Creator the character they were taken to reveal? The third question, so often raised, "Were they events which could not have been produced by natural causation?" seems to me one which should not be raised because, so far as I can see, it is impossible to give it a perfectly definite sense, and therefore impossible to answer it. Thus, as amended, the tentative definition I would propose for adoption in "apologetics" is that a miracle is a *res mirabilis quoad nos*, an event which to those who experience it is startling and out of the ordinary course of things, and is also a sign, a true indication of the divine character and purpose. If we can say of any event that it really occurred, and that it has this quality of specially disclosing the character of the divine, further argumentation about the

possibility of its production by " natural causes " seems to me to lead to no results.

Let me illustrate the position by one or two examples. It appears abundantly clear to me that it is an historical fact that our Lord first attracted public attention as a wonderful healer of maladies of various kinds, particularly of some which the belief of the time attributed to " possession," cases of epilepsy, dissociation of personality, and the like. I fully admit the legitimacy of asking the question whether the stories of these cures may not have grown in the telling, whether we can confidently rely on the details of individual narratives, and the like. But if we are to dispute the general fact, we shall, I believe, be driven into the impossible position of having to deny all historical value whatever to the Gospel records. And, again, for my own part, I feel no doubt that the witnesses of these cures were right in their inference that " no man can do these things except God be with him." What does seem to me idle, because incapable of being brought to a clear issue, is the dispute whether the cases of " possession," for example, were radically different from cases of disease which are sometimes successfully treated, though apparently never with the suddenness which is prominent in the Gospel narratives, by our modern physicians of the mentally disordered. That the word of Jesus should have healed the sufferers is neither more nor less wonderful, nor is the inference that the works were done by the " finger of God " really any the less certain because it is asserted that cases similar in kind are sometimes successfully treated to-day. If it were, the healing of Simon's wife's mother of her ague would lose all its value for us.

So again, it seems to me a fact which should simply be accepted as a fact that our Lord, once at least, wonderfully fed a great crowd in the wilderness, and that here again the wonderful work was rightly interpreted as a " sign " of many things. But I see no benefit to faith in speculative discussions of the manner in which the work was done, a matter of which the Evangelists say nothing. Did the loaves and fishes somehow " multiply " physically in the Lord's hands or in those of the Apostles ? Or did His wonderful teaching so engross the multitude that they forgot their hunger and thirst because their souls were feeding on living bread and drinking water of life ? Or did His example of boldly commanding His disciples to share their little store with the multitude make others forget their selfishness, so that what might have ministered to the superfluity of a few was found abundant for the necessity of many ? We have really no evidence on which to build a speculation. All we know is that the multitude were satisfied and that the

event was a sign to them of more things than one, of the care of the Father for the needs of His children, of the divine mission of the provider of the feast, of the unfailing supply of the "bread from heaven." If we decide for the physical multiplication of the loaves and fishes, do we *know* that such a thing will always appear to every intelligence the staggering marvel it appears to our own? All these questions seem to me strictly unanswerable, and for that reason I cannot conceive that it is essential to Christian faith that they should receive just one answer, whether the answer proposed be "traditionalist" or "modernist." The rule *in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas* seems to me in place here, and to be in danger of being forgotten by both "modernist" and "traditionalist."

Once more, then, I offer it as a tentative suggestion that we should adopt as our definition of a miracle the statement that it is a *res mirabilis quoad nos*, something surprising to *us*, interpreted rightly as a sign or indication of the presence of God as the source of all that is and happens.

It may be said that if we could look at things "with the eyes of God" we should see God *equally* in all that happens. I do not myself see that this is true. If the world is a hierarchized world, there *is* more of God to be seen, *e.g.*, in the facts of life than in the facts of chemical composition, and in the historical achievements of man than in the doings of apes or bears; and the Christian recognition of Christ as the "Word of God incarnate" means, of course, that God is to be seen in the life of Christ as He is not to be seen in the life of Plato or St. Louis or Wesley. But even apart from this, it would still be true that *quoad nos* the meaning of God's dealings with His creatures may well be more transparent in some passages of man's history than in others, and that the problem set before us, when we seek to know God, is, as Mr. Edwyn Bevan has urged, like the problem of discovering just which of the acts of our friend we may rightly take as those which yield the light in which the whole of his conduct is to be interpreted.

A. E. Taylor.

MIRACLES AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION

The problem of the miraculous in Christianity is not that of a unique claim. In whatever way the distinction between the Christian religion and other religions is to be truly drawn, it is not through an emphasis on the appearance of miracle as such in the Christian records. That is not to say that the accounts of miraculous occurrences preserved in the Christian

sacred books and in the sacred books of other faiths leave just the same impression as to their quality and character. But so far as supranormal events in the world of nature and in the curing of disease are concerned, what has to be faced is not the isolation of Christianity from other religions, but the presence of the miraculous in religion generally. And the Christian apologist or the Christian theologian may be expected to have an answer to the question, What is it that differentiates Biblical or New Testament miracles from ethnic miracles so as to make it possible and natural to believe in the one class when credence is refused to the other class? A view of Biblical inspiration which controlled the thought of Christians, both theologians and unlearned, both Catholics and Protestants, in former ages, made it easy to discriminate. But the discrimination then turned upon the authoritative character of the different documents, rather than upon inner differences in respect of the narratives and their contexts. Paley did apply himself to formal criticism of some non-Biblical miracles, but it is open to question how far that criticism is satisfactory, and in any case it was not necessary for people who tended to think of religious and sacred books simply in terms of true or false. To-day, the idea of Biblical inerrancy is no longer the sure foundation of a convincing apologetic, and that affects this question of the miraculous and necessitates a different kind of treatment.

The student of comparative religion may point to very widely spread beliefs that any kind of wonderful action is possible for the holy man or the magician who is in close touch with invisible divinities and knows the secret of drawing upon their unlimited power. To refer to only one corner of the field, O. Weinreich in his *Antike Heilungswunder* has gathered a rich collection of miraculous stories connected with the classical mythology. The cult of Asclepius was specially notable. Weinreich quotes a remark of Celsus to the effect that a great multitude of Greeks and barbarians testified to often seeing Asclepius, not his image but himself, in his healing ministrations.* And Ælius Aristides† speaks of the impossibility of arriving at the number of the miracles of the Saviour. We should like much more exact detail than we are given in the classical miracle-stories. But precise references, and a setting forth of evidence in a form suited to the law courts, imply canons of scientific procedure to which the ancient world had not attained. We have to do the best we can with what is given us, and except on wholly *a priori* grounds we need not feel obliged to reject all the stories wholesale. Unaccountable things may have happened at times, and may happen still. However large the proportion

* Origen c. Cels., iii., 24. † Weinreich, p. 199.

of fraud and credulity in magic, it does not follow that in the recognition of these elements we have the full explanation of all that would be, or has been, called magical. And where the question is not about magic but about religion a similar caution is desirable.

I

But whatever admissions of this kind may be made, the believer in the miracles of Christ and in the truth of what is recorded in the Gospels concerning the mode of His coming into the world and the character of His resurrection will, if the records of miracles in other religions and cults impress him at all as a noteworthy fact in the history of religions, look for reasons why he may be justified in giving to the Gospel miracles a position of their own.

In the first place, the problem is part of the much wider problem of the truth of religion. If the whole religious attitude is false and corresponds to no objective reality, no real distinction between one religion and another can be drawn. For that distinction lies within the belief however expressed, and in whatever systems apparent, that the word " God " has a real and not illusory meaning, and that God is concerned with man in some way or other. But if the religious attitude is regarded as the right one for man to adopt, then the whole question of the content of religious truth opens out. It is possible to take the line of the Theosophists and view all religions as particular forms of the one World-Religion, but if this solution of the problem of many religions is rejected, as Christians, with their grasp upon the principle of the transcendent become immanent, of prevenient grace, and of truth as involving a given, individual centre, do reject it, then the contrast between true and false is, with whatever modifications and softenings of the old position, inevitable. In anything that deserves the name of religion some truth is to be found, but Christianity is the true religion. And unless a miracle is regarded as lacking all possible religious significance, as mere un-moral, un-spiritual portent, and as being really incompatible with religion, there is nothing unreasonable in holding that, as Christianity differs from other religions in being that truth of which they contain adumbrations and fragments, so in it, in connection with the relationship of the world-order to God, certain supra-normal manifestations of spiritual power have taken place, and have exhibited in a unique way the responsiveness of the natural order to the divine will. And though it is certainly more difficult in these days to use miracle as an argument for the truth of Christianity, it does not follow that those are wrong who strongly emphasize the coherence of miracle in the Christian system.

II

In the second place, the distinction which exists between Jesus Christ and others who are thought of as founders of religions must not be ignored. Both in the mind of His disciples and His community and in His own mind He has a position which was not claimed by or claimed for Confucius or Lao-tse, Gautama or Mohammed. His mighty works as recorded in the Gospels are one of the ways in which His Sonship to God, revealed at these points through the spirit and power of absolute confidence in God, finds expression. And with this there is no true parallel. Christ is not one of a class, and the bracketing of Him with moral philosophers and prophetic personalities as though any real comparison were possible is most misleading.

This recollection of the difference between Christ and others to whom religious systems owe their names is a barrier to the idea that miracle-stories associated with Him and with them can all be dismissed on the ground that such stories inevitably gather round the central figure of a religion. Even if in all that concerned the appearance of such stories there were a close parallel in Christianity, Buddhism, and Mohammedanism, which is not the case, it would not follow that this belief in the miracles of Mohammed or the Buddha logically involved disbelief in the miracles of Christ, any more than disbelief in Mohammed as the Prophet of God involves disbelief in Christ as the Son of God. If the absoluteness and finality of the Christian religion is bound up with the Person of Christ, and He is that new beginning in humanity which St. Paul described as the Second Adam, there is no common ground on which to judge of the miraculous in the life of Christ and in the lives of those others.

It is worth noting in this connection that while, if the Gospels are in any way reliable, Christ not only had the power, but claimed to have the power to do things of a supra-normal character, the same cannot be said of the Buddha and of Mohammed. Thus, in *The Book of the Great Decease*,* which may date from about 300 B.C., only one miracle is ascribed to the Buddha, that of passing in a moment from one bank to the other of the flooded Ganges,† while in a passage of the *Dhammapada* we have what may be a protest of the Buddha against the belief in miraculous powers in the words "there is no path through the air; a man is not a Samaṇa outwardly."‡ Again, Mohammed works no miracles in the Qur'ān, and as to the various

* *Sacred Books of the East*, xi. † P. 21.

‡ *S. B. E.*, x., p. 64. In his note Max Müller refers to a command of the Buddha to his disciples: "I command my disciples not to work miracles, but to hide their good deeds and to show their sins."

miracles which gathered round the Prophet's name, Sir William Muir says that "with respect to all such stories, it is sufficient to say that they are opposed to the clear declarations and pervading sense of the Corân."* This absence of miracle from the Qur'ān is the more significant in that Mohammedanism is the religion of a miraculous book, for so the Qur'ān must be regarded by those who believe it to be a communication or series of communications from God through Gabriel.

III

The fault of not making necessary distinctions is continued when the difficulties between the Bible and other books are lost sight of, as in some such catch phrase as "there is not one Bible, there are many Bibles." And where the question of miracles is at issue, it is unreasonable that the Gospels should *a priori* suffer a loss of credence at those points where the element of miracle appears. A useful comparison and contrast with the apocryphal Gospels may here be made. There are three chief reasons why no one need spend any time over the credibility of the miracles recounted in them; their authors are unknown, but what can be inferred as to them does not suggest that they had trustworthy information to give; their dates are removed by a century or so from the events which they recount; and a good number of the miracle stories are intrinsically incredible, if any stories are rightly judged to be so. With the canonical Gospels the conditions are quite different, whatever uncertainties exist as to the authorship and date of, in particular, the first and the fourth Gospels. Into the general credibility of St. Mark's Gospel and St. Luke's it is unnecessary to go, but what needs to be emphasized is that, as on the ground of the scientific weighing of evidence it would be ridiculous to argue from the incredibility of the miracles in the apocryphal Gospels to the incredibility of the miracles in the canonical Gospels, so it is absurd to discount these latter because miracles are to be found in the *Sacred Books of the East* and in Græco-Roman literature. The stories told in connection with the birth of Lao-tse and of the Buddha are fantastical; so are some of those in the apocryphal Gospels where the birth of Christ is the subject of the narrative, but the Lucan and Matthæan accounts are of no such character. Of Lao-tse it was told that he was eighty-one years concealed in his mother's womb, and "with his first breath he was endowed with complete intelligence and possessed of the power of speech."† In the *Jataka* the Buddha, while still in the womb, is made to preach to angels, and when the aged saint

* *The Life of Mahomet*, p. 590.
† Douglas, *Confucianism and Taoism*, p. 179.

from the Himalayas comes to Kapilevastu after the child's birth, the child's feet are miraculously placed on his hair, whereupon the sage "prophesies that the child will become a Buddha, and weeps that he himself will not live to see the day,"* which is interesting by reason of its likeness and unlikeness to the Lucan story of Simeon. Stories of this kind tend to lay stress upon the element of portent in miracle. Wendland, in his book *Miracles and Christianity*, refers to Strange's attempt to discriminate between Biblical and heathen miracles. Not in every case can a real discrimination be discovered, and Wendland holds that Strange presses the moral side of the Biblical miracles too far. But of the Gospel miracles it may fairly be said that the element of portent (τέρας) is precisely that to which the Evangelists do not seem to attach importance. The resurrection narratives are very notable; miracle is written all over them, but of emphasis upon physical marvel, except for a verse or two in St. Matthew's Gospel, there is hardly anything. In the Apocryphal Gospel of Peter, on the other hand, the most striking feature is that which is pure physical marvel—the appearance of the three figures who come out from the tomb.

In that notable study of the supernatural element in Christianity entitled *Redemption from this World*, in which he devoted so much space to the transcendent power of Christ manifested in miracle, Professor A. G. Hogg gave special attention to the connection in the Gospel narratives between miracle and faith. It was not simply that our Lord looked for faith in those who came to Him for healing, but that He Himself had perfect faith in His Father's willingness to answer any call that was made upon Him. There is a true sense in which miracle is the dearest child of faith, in that faith sees in miracle the complete vindication of its own reliance upon God's goodness and power to help. Or if we try to understand the meaning of miracle as an act of God in the world, we shall find Schultz, in his *Old Testament Theology*,† not far off the truth when he identifies as the essence of miracle its specially clear and striking revelation of the power and freedom of God in the promotion of His ends, so that it is not sufficient to stop at the thought of its marvellous contrariety to the ordinary course of nature. As the idea of faith in God, which is so deeply and richly manifested and illustrated in the New Testament, represents, apart from its roots in Old Testament piety, something new and strong in man's approach to God, which is not merely a higher or different form of something found also in ethnic religions, so are the Gospel miracles distinguished from ethnic miracles by their spiritual characteristics and especially by their exhibition of mercy and benevolence.

* Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, p. 185. † Quoted by Wendland, *op. cit.*

The constant association of miracle with religion may be interpreted in one of two ways. It may be discounted as one and the most striking instance of the tendency of the human mind to prefer and demand the extraordinary and the unaccountable—except for its solution in the sheer power of divinity—in religion, to seek for the justification of religion in the region of physical marvel. On the other hand, the association may appear too deeply rooted to be explained away as no more than a supreme example of erroneous subjectivism. If the second view is taken, the case against miracles is not prejudged in advance; as to what miracles are regarded as actually credible will depend upon the opinions formed of the religions in which they appear, of the backing that they have in historical evidence, and of the possible relationship under certain conditions between spiritual causes and physical effects.

J. K. Mozley.

MIRACLES AND SACRAMENTS

The religious significance of miracles is held to be that they give assurance of the ultimate subordination of the natural order to ethical or spiritual ends by means of a special instance in which the natural order is manifestly interrupted, so as to bring about a result ethically or spiritually desirable which would not have been possible without such an interruption of the natural order. It is therefore a condition of the religious significance of a miracle, thus conceived, that it should consist in a breach of that order of nature the discovery of which is the business of the natural sciences.

We are not here concerned with the evidence for any particular alleged miracles, but only with the general character of miracles (if miracles there be) as "evidences of Religion," to use an expression which is sanctioned by long usage.

It is important in the first place to distinguish the question about the religious significance of miracles from the question of the possibility of their occurrence. Of course, if the occurrence of miracles can be shown to be impossible *a priori* the question of the religious significance which can be attributed to them will not arise at all. But I do not think that the occurrence of miracles can be intelligibly said to be *a priori* impossible.

We cannot indeed conceive that anything happens without a ground or cause. But no intelligent defender of miracles is concerned to show that they happen without a ground or cause; indeed, the evidential character attributed to them would be destroyed if they did so happen. All that is supposed is that certain particular laws or observed uniformities do not exclude

exceptions which *can* be accounted for by voluntary but not human agency; and this can surely not be said to be *a priori* impossible. There is no *a priori* impossibility in the existence of rational beings other and more powerful than men; the occurrence of an event which would be inexplicable on mechanical grounds without the intervention of a rational being, where no human agency had intervened, would be sufficient to constitute a miracle in the ordinary sense of the word; but this would no more violate the order of nature which we postulate *a priori* than the actions of human beings actually do. We may therefore dismiss the doctrine of the *a priori* impossibility of miracles. But this does not prove that they have actually occurred, or that, if they have occurred or should occur, they would possess religious significance.

I think that people often feel themselves not fairly dealt with in such arguments as I have just put forward against the theory that miracles are *a priori* impossible. As Hume said of Berkeley's arguments against the existence of unperceived matter, these reasonings seem to them indeed to admit of no answer, but also to produce no conviction. That miracles are not impossible in the sense in which it is *a priori* impossible for two contradictory propositions to be simultaneously true or in which it is impossible for 2+2 to=5, few would care, it may be said, to deny. And yet we do not commonly feel for all that that there is no better reason for disbelieving the report of a miracle than there would be for disbelieving anything that is not *a priori* impossible in that sense. We feel that it *is* reasonable to feel ourselves better justified in questioning an assertion that water has been turned into wine, a storm allayed by a word, or a dead man recalled to life, not only than the report of some quite everyday occurrence, such as a bicycle accident, but even than the announcement of some very unexpected phenomenon, such as was some years ago that of the first use of the X rays to show the bones of a doctor's patient beneath the skin and flesh which covered them. As Bacon observed long ago, the exploits of Alexander and Julius Cæsar are more wonderful than the legendary doings of Amadis of Gaul, and what Tennyson called " the fairy tales of science " are often more astonishing than the fairy tales of our childhood; yet they are not really fairy tales come true; they are wonderful indeed—perhaps, we may think, more wonderful than the old fairy tales—but not in the same kind of way. It is by no means easy to describe what that is which constitutes the difference, but that there is such a difference is, I think, unmistakable to any unprejudiced mind; and I suppose it is to be found in the consistency of the fairy tales of science and the inconsistency of

the others with that indifference to our personal desires which seems to characterize the order of Nature as it is revealed to us by scientific investigation. Is not this "sorry scheme of things," as Fitzgerald's Omar calls it, although doubtless there is found room in it for much happiness, much love, much moral and spiritual excellence, after all one in which these are always liable, and in the long run certain, to be disappointed of perfect fulfilment? But miracles, if we could assure ourselves of the sufficiency of the evidence for their occurrence, might seem to afford some ground for believing that, even though we cannot for ourselves "shatter" it and "remould it nearer to the heart's desire," yet there *does* exist a power not indifferent to our ideals, which, standing outside of the system of the world investigated by the natural sciences, is able to postpone to a realization of our ideals even the laws, as we call them, which in our common experience seem to belong to the ultimate framework of existence; that framework which determines our whole spiritual life, but is not itself affected thereby.

It must be frankly admitted that the denial on such grounds as were alleged above of the *a priori* impossibility of miracles does not really touch the question whether as a matter of fact such violations of natural law as we should call miracles are or are not agreeable to the constitution of the universe.

There is a passage of St. Augustine, which is often quoted in discussions about miracles, in which he distinguishes two senses of the word Nature; one in which it includes whatever actually occurs; and another in which it denotes the ordinary course of events (*c. Faustum*, xxvi. 3). A miracle, according to St. Augustine, falls within nature in the former, outside of it in the latter sense.

The observation is perfectly just. But we must here be careful not, with some hasty apologists of miracle, to construe "ordinary" too narrowly. It does not suffice to make an event *miraculous*, in the sense in which the miraculous could possibly have, as such, religious value, that it should be extraordinary in the sense of "seldom observed"; only if it be *inexplicable*—and not merely *unexplained*—by the principles of scientific explanation, would it be miraculous to any religious purpose which miracles have been usually supposed to subserve. It is no doubt true that sometimes the reports of certain occurrences have been neglected by scientific men on account of their being described by unscientific people in unscientific language, and in contexts which did not inspire confidence, and yet have afterwards been accepted; but only because they have been brought under the general principles of scientific explanation. Thus it was long before men of science accepted the narratives of the fall of meteorites as descriptions of real facts. These

falls are seldom observed, and, when they are observed, the chances are that the observers are persons destitute of scientific culture, incapable of accurate observation, and possessed by superstitious terror. Hence accounts of what happened on such occasions had usually an air of fairy tale which discredited them. No scientific man now doubts that meteorites fall and that stories of such falls were often stories of real events; but there is nothing in the fall of meteorites as now accepted which is miraculous or extraordinary in the sense of being intractable to the ordinary principles of scientific explanation or of implying the activity of any superhuman will.

But if the occurrence of an event were to be sufficiently attested which should be inexplicable by the ordinary principles of scientific explanation together with the intervention of a human will, such an event might fairly be called a miracle, although plainly it would not fall outside of nature in that sense of the word in which it means all that is. For *ex hypothesi* it would really have occurred, and our conception of nature in this widest sense would have to be enlarged so as to include it.

It will, however, be apparent that miracles in this sense, did they occur, would be rather evidence of the existence of some spiritual beings of superhuman power and indications of the character of these than evidences of direct divine action, if by *divine* we mean to refer to the ultimate ground of all things. And we may here notice as a significant fact that the period in which the greatest emphasis was laid by theologians upon the evidence of miracles *as such* seems to have followed closely upon the decay of belief in such supernatural beings as angels, saints, and devils had been supposed in an earlier age to be. While the belief in such supernatural beings is alive, the first question about any supposed miracle is the question to what kind of a being is it to be attributed; and it is sought to find tests by which a divine origin may be distinguished from other possible origins of any miraculous occurrence.

There is no *a priori* ground for excluding the possibility of the causation of events by finite but superhuman beings; so that we still remain under the old disability to be certain whether any miracles that might actually occur would be directly evidential of the character and purpose of God—any more, that is to say, than would be events due to the action of human beings.

And not only do we still lie under this disability. We may also reasonably ask what exactly is meant by thinking of miracles as even *possibly* in this way directly significant of the character of God? Religion cannot be content with thinking only *some* events divinely caused. It aims at seeing all in God and God in all. Miracles might attest the activity of a supernatural and

superhuman being; but God is not *a* supernatural being alongside of others. Hence it would seem to follow that it would only be *subjectively* that miracles could be considered as specially divine operations. When a scientific lecturer exhibits an experiment in illustration of his teaching we are not witnessing anything that belongs any *more* to the regular order of nature about which he is telling us than anything else that happens; but the experiment may, by what Bacon might have called its *prerogative* character, suggest to us some universal characteristic of matter which we might not otherwise have observed. In the same manner certain events might bring forcibly to our mind the ethical or spiritual character of an order of things which we might not otherwise have perceived to possess such a character. They might thus reveal God to us without being *objectively* divine operations in a sense in which other events are not.

I will here interpose an observation which is, I think, of some importance. The practical application of scientific knowledge may be rightly said to illustrate the triumph of mind over matter; and it may very possibly be true that the power of the human mind to affect the body with which it is associated, and through this its material environment, extends further than has often been supposed. But it is sometimes thought that this consideration is of more value for the purposes of religion than it seems to me in fact to be. I am thinking of a kind of argument with which one sometimes meets in apologetic literature which infers that if the minds of men of like passions with ourselves can affect their material environment as much as they sometimes seem able to do, *a fortiori* a sinless humanity like that which Christians attribute to our Lord might be expected to do so to a vastly higher degree. But there seems to me to be no sort of evidence that there is in point of fact any tendency whatever for the power of the human mind over its material environment to vary directly with the holiness or spirituality of the person exerting it, such as might by analogy render credible a *natural* power to work miracles in the holiest and most spiritual persons; and I am disposed to think that St. Thomas Aquinas was well advised in regarding this argument, which was familiar to mediæval scholars in the writings of the Mohammedan philosopher Avicenna, as one to be avoided by Christian theologians. St. Thomas's own view is that miraculous power is never natural, and that miracles in the proper sense are wrought by God, and by God alone.

Are we then to distinguish the attribution of what some have called "preferential action" to God from the assertion that God works miracles? Perhaps not; for "preferential" divine action could only, it would seem, be distinguished from

other events, which must all be referred in some sense to the divine activity, by their inconsistency with the usual order, according to which the predictions of natural science are made, together with the impossibility of attributing them to human agency—in other words, by their miraculous character. It would still, however, be necessary to find a means of distinguishing them from events which might be traced to the agency of superhuman beings other than God.

We must observe that, in any case, religion, if it should accomplish its task of finding God in *all*, would have by that time passed beyond the stage at which (if the occurrence of events which may be called miracles be admitted) these miracles would have the special significance which might have belonged to them so long as they were needed to show that the world could not be completely understood as a system of mechanical laws, or at least of mechanical laws together with human agency.

At the beginning of Hume's famous Essay on Miracles he quotes an argument of Tillotson's against the Roman Catholic doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist.* "Were it never so clearly revealed in Scripture," says Tillotson, "it were directly contrary to the rules of just reasoning to give our assent to it. It contradicts sense, though both Scripture and tradition, on which it is supposed to be built, carry no such evidence with them as sense." This passage of Tillotson, quoted with approval by Hume, seems to me to illustrate very well a difference of temper between ourselves and the men of the eighteenth century which greatly affects their and our respective attitudes towards this question of miracles.

Tillotson and Hume, although the former believed in the occurrence of certain miracles and the latter thought that no evidence could ever be sufficient to justify belief in a miracle —since it would always be more likely that the witnesses were mistaken than that an unprecedented event had occurred— were yet agreed that, while a religion might legitimately appeal to a prodigy as evidence of its truth, to suppose a miracle where the ordinary causes could account for the sensible appearances, as in the Eucharist, was plainly absurd, and, in Hume's words, a "doctrine little worthy of serious refutation."

* I am not here concerned with the accuracy of Tillotson's or Hume's notion of this doctrine. As a matter of fact, the doctrine of Transubstantiation does not contradict sense, for the "sensible" accidents are not supposed to be altered by the words of consecration. The *philosopher* may reasonably doubt whether their continuance in existence without a "substance" in which to "inhere" is possible or even intelligible. But the scientific man (whom the ordinary man is usually inclined to trust as the interpreter of the reality revealed through sense) is, as a scientific man, interested only in what the scholastic theologians would call the "accidents," and is in no way committed to the belief that there must be over and above them a "substance" in which they "inhere."

Most of us, on the other hand, are, I think, differently minded. We readily sympathize with the sentiment implied in Aristotle's remark that the universe is not ἐπεισοδιώδης, full of disconnected passages, "like a bad tragedy." The conception of divine *interference* is repellent to the temper of our age, trained as we are in faith in, and reverence for, that mighty order, reaching through space and time, which is being ever more and more fully revealed to us by the natural sciences. We would gladly rid religion altogether of that conception of *interference*. It is no doubt possible to contend that in this we are only the victims of a fashionable but unreasonable prejudice. But the prejudice is certainly there. On the other hand, a "miracle" (if we are so to call it) like that which is by some said to take place in the Eucharist, one in which there is no breach of natural law to be detected, but in which a physical process becomes the vehicle of a spiritual—even as a letter or a speech is spiritually effective, although natural science finds itself nowhere checked in its endeavour to trace out the physical processes involved—such a miracle is far less repugnant to our taste, if I may so express myself, than one which should baffle and confound scientific investigation. And it is just this sort of "miracle" (though we may perhaps think the word "miracle" misleading on account of its associations, when used in this reference)—a "miracle" in which there is no breach of natural law that natural science can possibly detect, and yet in which a spiritual effect is experienced—that is the sort of "miracle" most acceptable to our present ways of thinking.

The upshot of this discussion of miracles is to suggest that, even if satisfied of their occurrence, we should still be doubtful of their value as evidences of religion; and on this account there are many to whom belief in any other kind of miracle than that involved in the sacramental mediation of spiritual grace through material means has ceased to be a part of their religious faith.

This perception of the spiritual in what is material, yet not in the vulgar sense of the word "miraculous," may be focussed in certain acts, as in the belief in *sacraments;* or spread over the whole of life, as in belief in *providence;* and we must remember that the deepest thought of those whose theological starting-point has been the recognition of sacramental grace has given a sacramental significance to nature as a whole. The belief in "miracles" was an attempt to find God in nature, but only *here* and *there* in nature. If we turn from the religious man's view of "nature" as distinguished from "history" to his view of "history" general or individual, we find corresponding to that attempt an analogous attempt, by way of belief in a *sacred*

history and in *prophecy*, to find God *here* and *there* in the life of man. With the advance of natural science we find it harder and harder to assure ourselves that many or perhaps any of the comparatively well-attested events called miraculous—for some such there are—were really miraculous in the sense of being inexplicable along the lines of scientific explanation.

But we may recognize that the discovery in these events of a spiritual significance was really spiritually effective; and we tend to fall back upon the view that they were not the less in fact ministerial to spiritual ends because they were not naturally and scientifically inexplicable, and might by a more advanced natural science than that of the time when they happened have been explained, any more than the "scraping of horsehair upon catgut" in a symphony of Beethoven is the less spiritually significant and monotonous because it offers no puzzles to the investigator of the physical processes involved. We thus find ourselves at the opposite pole of feeling to Tillotson and Hume, and see in what I may call a sacramental miracle not the most absurd but the most intelligible or even the only intelligible kind of miracle.

We find ourselves in an analogous position in respect to sacred history and to prophecy. Criticism suggests that, for example, the aspect in which the author of the Books of Chronicles represents the history of the Kings of Israel is not that which it can wear to a modern historical student; that the predictions of the prophets of the Old Testament do not really express a mysterious knowledge of events yet to come, but a certain—and often a one-sided—interpretation of the events of their own time; and that in their anticipations of the future it is the wish, or at any rate the moral judgment, that was father to their thought of what was to be. Nevertheless, the spiritual force and effectiveness of these interpretations of the past and forecasts of the future are undeniable; and here, too, we try to substitute for the old belief in a specially sacred history and in prophecy a view of history as throughout amenable to ordinary rules of interpretation and yet as the vehicle of a progressive manifestation of God.

We may further note that in our individual religious experience an analogous process of thought often takes place. Men, in looking back upon their lives, often find themselves less able than they had once thought to assure themselves that critical epochs in their religious career are incapable of such natural explanations as might satisfy an external observer. We may notice, in particular, that the recent study, principally carried on by American psychologists, of the phenomena of *conversion* seems to point to the comparative normality of such an experi-

ence at certain stages of psychological development. All the same, the same men who would admit that there was nothing miraculous, in the sense of scientifically unaccountable, in what has happened to themselves, are no less able to recognize in the course of their lives what they can call the "hand of God." From a religious point of view that may be "providential" which from a non-religious point of view requires no extraordinary explanation.

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

BELIEF IN MIRACLES

I

THE passing of Naturalism as a complete philosophy of life has relieved the discussion of this problem of some of those antecedent objections to miracle which were urged in the name of science a generation ago. It is still true, no doubt, as Bacon says, that "when the second causes, which are next unto the senses, do offer themselves to the mind of man, if it dwell and stay there it may induce some oblivion of the highest cause."* But such a repudiation of miracle as Harnack avows on the ground that "what happens in time and space is subject to the universal laws of movement,"† no longer appeals to an age which is being taught by the theory of Relativity to recast the Newtonian laws of motion and to regard time and space as little more than subjective conceptions. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to suppose that the breakdown of Mechanism—or of the religious palimpsest upon it which we call Pantheism‡—as a sufficient explanation of reality,§ makes belief in miracle easy to men of scientific temper. Such belief has to meet another and more formidable objection, less academic, more popular, and in its surface bearing undeniable.

The opponent of miracle to-day, then, points not to philosophy but to the history of European thought. He urges that belief in miracle has in fact been in direct ratio to the prevalence of ignorance. The real issue is not so much miracle as the narrative of miracle; and there are few such narratives which will stand investigation. From the time of Augustine to the end of the Middle Ages allegations of miracle pile up with increasing

* *Advancement of Learning*, p. 134 (Gibbings, 1891).

† *What is Christianity?* p. 27.

‡ *Cf.* W. R. Sorley, *Moral Values and the Idea of God*: "If physical science aspires to be a philosophy, and is not content with naturalism, it may find in monism a fitting metaphysical refuge."

§ Lord Haldane has given the title of Humanism to the philosophy which rejects Mechanism in this sense.

velocity. Then comes the Renaissance; and with the new birth of knowledge in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, we witness the reverse process. Occurrences formerly adduced as miraculous are seen to be explicable by natural causes. The outcrop of records of miracle dies down and almost disappears. The earlier narratives are traced to a childish credulity, if not to actual *chicane*. Miracles become not an aid to, but an incubus on, Christian belief; and the apologist must either discredit the new knowledge or else come to terms.

We propose to come to terms; but we do not think that they are terms of surrender. The case as pleaded is undoubtedly a strong one. The fact, for instance, that belief in, and narratives of, miracles have receded as knowledge has increased is one that few would deny. The question is whether the implication —viz., that " miracles do not happen "—is the right one. Let us begin by a provisional definition of miracle as an abnormal event in the physical order, apprehensible by the senses, to which religious significance attaches.* Scepticism with regard to miracle may then rest on either of two grounds. It may deny that abnormal events did, or do, happen; or it may grant their occurrence, but deny their significance for religion. In either case miracle, as the Church conceives it, would be discredited.

1. *The Occurrence of Abnormal Events.*—For the purpose of our present discussion we should limit the word " abnormal " to events in which the normal sequence of physical cause and effect seems to have been set aside; though we should claim that such abnormal happenings as a sudden conversion were in fact very germane to the problem. But, using the word in its more restricted sense, how do we find the matter stand ? Is it the case that abnormal events in this sense are to-day without credence amongst educated people ? The answer would seem to be decisively No. Indeed, if there is one tendency which seems to stand out clearly in modern thought to-day it is the disposition to recognize more and more the extraordinary potencies of human personality, to discard the hard-and-fast line which used to be drawn between spirit and matter, and to regard spiritual factors such as motive, moral effort, and mental condition as having a direct bearing upon physical symptoms. Members of the medical profession, for example, are prepared to admit numerous cases where a normal prognosis, based on the bodily symptoms, would premise almost certainly a fatal end to a sickness, but where the interposition of definite and particular mental or spiritual causes has led to recovery. Furthermore, little attempt is made nowadays to confine such cures to " func-

* Based on Wendland, *Miracles and Christianity.*

tional," as distinct from "organic," disorders.* It may be urged that cases of this character, though "abnormal," are not "miraculous." In that case the term would have to be denied to all such New Testament miracles as fall within this category. The fact is that some New Testament miracles do conform to this canon, while others, equally well attested, do not.† But all alike—those which are parallel in modern medicine and psychotherapy no less than those which are not—are properly called "miracles." In the latter case the degree of abnormality is greater than in the former; and therefore stronger evidence will be required to convince us of their occurrence; and also we may reasonably expect evidence of some more powerful stimulus at work here (such as religion *ex hypothesi* provides) than is involved in the use of simple suggestion or other psychical methods. We may sum up the position, in short, by saying that (*a*) abnormal occurrences are admitted to occur to-day no less than in "the ages of faith"; (*b*) many of these occurrences would have been called "miracles" in those ages, but are not so called now; (*c*) the apparent failure to find parallels to-day to the more markedly normal occurrences involved in some of the New Testament and other records of miracles admits of the explanation that an adequate stimulus to their production has been wanting or that care was not taken to certify them by evidence of the right kind.

2. *Significance for Religion.*—We thus reach a point at which the modern doubt of miracle is found to turn not so much on the denial that abnormal events occur, as on the denial that they have significance for religion. It is human personality, not Divine, which emerges as the cause of these abnormalities. Yet such a statement of the case will bring its own cautions; for it is symptomatic of a revolution in human thought which stretches out far beyond the sphere of miracle. A thing has significance for religion when it is ascribed to a cause with which religion has to do—*e.g.*, God or supernatural agency generally—or teaches a religious lesson; and perhaps we could hardly represent what the Renaissance and the Reformation meant for European thought more vividly than by considering how much of human life, then or subsequently, lost a significance for religion which once it had. Government, education, medicine, law, economics, science, art—there was scarcely a function of social life which was not emancipated sooner or later from any palpable connection with religion. We are not concerned here either to justify or to cavil at the fact, but to note it. For it provides all the explanation we need of the fact that belief in miracle has

* *Cf.* the quotations from Baudouin and Bjerre in Micklem, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, pp. 21, 22.

† *Cf.* Micklem, *op. cit.*, 136.

receded in proportion as the New Knowledge has gained ground. When every aspect of human knowledge has changed its significance, it is not surprising that the abnormal experiences called "miracles" should have done so too; especially as the change in men's attitude to these experiences is entirely concordant with that stress upon man's natural freedom, worth, and capacity which is so characteristic of the modern world. So that the problem of miracle is really only a part of the much larger problems of the place of religion in life, of grace and free will, of the Church and the World; and it is there that the battle will be lost or won.

II

It has been said* that one of the main difficulties in regard to miracle with which the early Fathers of the Church had to contend arose from their alleged frequency. Popular belief among the ancients was firmly seized of the idea that human life was surrounded and influenced by a multiplicity of supernatural agencies, both good and evil—an idea, we may add, which finds an echo in the writings of St. Paul—and it was customary to ascribe to such agencies any abnormal event. Thus, amongst most primitive peoples, sneezing was considered a miracle, being abnormal in the sense of being sudden, and was attributed to a demon. Epilepsy and seizures of cramp, being the work of evil spirits, and visions and ecstasies, being the work of good spirits, were alike miracles. Suetonius speaks of a cure wrought by the Emperor Vespasian as miraculous, using the term not merely because it was extraordinary, but because the Emperor was himself divine. And the same view is found in the Bible. The place of visions and ecstasies is well enough known from the times of Jacob or Manoah to those of St. Peter at Joppa. Disease is definitely attributed to diabolic agency. Our Lord asks about the woman who had a spirit of infirmity: "Ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan had bound, lo, these eighteen years, to have been loosed from this bond on the day of the Sabbath?" It is true that the Synoptists and our Lord use the word "miracle" mainly of saving acts, such as healing or exorcism; though we must be careful to remember that they are not confined to our Lord. When the disciples came and told Him of a man at Capernaum whom they had seen casting out devils in His name, He accepted the fact without demur, and told them that they were to leave him alone. But even Jesus Himself does not confine miracle to what is beneficent; for He says that in the last times "there shall arise false Christs and false prophets and shall show

* Wendland, *op. cit.*

signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect" (Mark xiii. 22); and similar miraculous powers are ascribed to Antichrist in the second Epistle to the Thessalonians (ii. 9). The sphere of miracle, that is to say, in antiquity is a very large one, embracing any abnormal event in which supernatural agency is believed to be at work.

At the same time, in this as in all other spheres of religious belief we find the ideas of the Bible, whether Jewish or Christian, at once more reverent and more reasonable than those of the surrounding paganism. On the one hand, the idea of miracle is profoundly affected by Jewish monotheism. In addition to the word τέρας, wonder or portent, which suggests the felt abnormality or incongruity of the miraculous event, and the word σημεῖον, sign, which connotes the supernatural agency behind it, the writers of Scripture also use the word δύναμις, or work of power. The word is important; for it enables us to understand how for them even the normal phenomena of Nature, if they are sufficiently impressive, may be regarded as miracles. Thus, in the Book of Job, rain, the sunrise, earthquake, calm after storm at sea, the constellations—all these are considered miracles: for all are on the grand scale, productive of wonder and awe, and all come from His hand. He made the sun stand still over Ajalon: but He also sends the wind and the snow, the grotesque unicorn, the war-horse that "paweth in the valley," the crocodile and the hippopotamus.* The Psalms are equally steeped in this belief: witness the 68th or 104th or 147th. God is the agent in and the sustainer of all Nature and all life, in their familiar no less than their unfamiliar manifestations; and there is thus brought into the conception of miracle a unifying principle which is absent from non-Biblical thought.

To this influence of monotheism on belief in miracle must be added another, due to the teaching and practice of Christ and His Apostles. We are told that at Nazareth Jesus Himself could do no mighty work because of their unbelief (Matt. xiii. 58; Mark vi. 5, 6); and in the New Testament generally the exercise of miraculous powers is commonly conditioned by the faith of those who will be the recipients of their benefits.† The rule is not exclusive in practice;‡ but our Lord's insistence upon it in His teaching is such as to warrant an important inference. This is that the co-operation of man's faith is normally necessary to the exercise of that divine activity which manifests itself in abnormal works of power. Taken in conjunction with monotheism, this requirement of human faith enables Christian

* Job xxxviii.-xlii. It is the spectacle of these mysterious works of power and wonder that brings Job to "repent in dust and ashes" (xlii. 5), and so provides the solution of the drama. *Cf.* Otto, *The Idea of the Holy*, 80 *ff.*

† *Cf.* Mark ix. 13.

‡ *Cf.*, *e.g.*, Acts iii. 5, viii. 40.

theology to set limits to credulity and imparts a rational and moral criticism into the conception of the miraculous. Not that all supernatural agency but that of God is excluded; nor that miraculous works are confined to those who believe: but at least laws are indicated which dispose of the notion that the forces of the spiritual world are arbitrary or capricious. And the result is to give to miracle a great significance for religion.

III

This outline of the attitude towards miracle found in Holy Scripture entitles us without doubt to regard the riot of credulity in which the mediæval writers of *Acta Sanctorum* indulged as a form of theological decadence; and many of their stories can be dismissed at once as due to a lack—sometimes a culpable lack—of any true spirit of enquiry.* But when every concession to scientific investigation that can fairly be asked for has been made, there remains an amount of evidence as to miracle in the history of the Church which both in volume and in quality is very difficult to gainsay; and we believe that Christian thought will be far better occupied in trying to understand it than to gainsay it. Even if we could get rid of the evidence of past ages, there are well-verified experiences in our own day, both without the Church and within it, which appear to fall well within the definition of miracle as an abnormal event having reference to supernatural agency; and it is important that theology should not find itself so ill-equipped to account for these things as did the scientific world of a generation ago when confronted with the *data* of telepathy and psychical research.

1. In the first place, then, Christianity is a religion which believes in a God who acts. In any kind of monism God is conceived of as eternally *in statu quo*, and the attribution of any action to Him would be a contradiction. But for Christianity He is eternally active, creative, redemptive. We think of the world as His creation; of history as the unfolding of His providential purpose; of man as the subject of His increasing Self-revelation and gifts of grace. We conceive of the natural order as a kind of enclave within the spiritual, which alone is ultimately real, and which encompasses our life here on every side. At innumerable points this unseen order interpenetrates the visible; but its presence is seen most clearly in human character in its nobler manifestations, felt most keenly in prayer and devotion, and found with unique satisfaction in Christ alone. He "was from heaven," and is still "the door"; and He estab-

* *Cf.* the opinion of Fr. Delehaye, S.J., quoted by Gore, *Belief in God*, p. 261, with Gore's added words: "Some mediæval miracles rest on evidence that seems to be conclusive."

lished a covenant between God and man, whereby man's heart is perpetually cleansed, renewed, and fortified by the Spirit of God. When this action of God in human affairs is discerned, especially in the ordering and juxtaposition of events, we speak of His Providence; when in the individual life of moral effort, we speak of His grace; when in the fellowship of the Church, we name rather the power of the Holy Ghost.

2. Secondly, we find that this interaction of the divine with the human spirit overflows into the material order. The simplest case is the effect of faith and prayer upon the bodily health and condition of the believer. It has needed the evidence of mental and spiritual healing to bring home to us a fact of which the records of normal religious experience, as expressed for example in the Psalter, afford abounding evidence. In our own day we are coming more and more to see how much the *corpus sanum* owes to the *sana mens ;* and for Christians the *sana mens* is a mind that worships God and is renewed by His grace. But there is another case of such overflow which is also germane to our purpose. We mean the case of sacraments. The Catholic belief is that sacraments are not simply signs or pledges by which we assure ourselves of God's favour, but also channels of His grace. At the same time, for every sacrament a celebrant is needed; and it is always by human mediation that form and matter (to use a convenient scholastic distinction) become conjoined in any sacrament.

Such considerations suggest that we should view miracle as an extension of the constant interaction of God with man to which religion testifies, and of its overflow into the material order as illustrated in the healing effects of prayer and in sacraments. The advantages of such a view may be summarized shortly. (1) It proceeds in the proper order from the better known to the less known. God's action in human souls and in sacraments is something which to Catholic Christians, at any rate, is a fundamental implicate of their faith—part of the " mystery " or " secret " of the divine counsel of which they claim to be seized. To place miracles in that setting is to place them as they are placed in the New Testament.* The relative privacy of the New Testament miracles, their restriction to small and limited groups, coupled with our Lord's refusal to give the Jews any " sign," argues them as belonging in some mysterious way to a mode of action which is hidden from the world, but known to believers.

3. This idea of the conditionment of miraculous action by human mediation is free from the note of irrationality which

* And, we may add, the Old. *Cf.* the miracles of Elisha, of which Dean Stanley says, " There alone in the Sacred History the gulf between Biblical and Ecclesiastical miracles almost disappears " (H.J.C., ii. 279).

always seems to haunt the "interventionist" language so often used in defence of miracle. If such language is not to create the impression of God's character being essentially incalculable, it is necessary to support it by pointing to a crisis in human affairs when miraculous intervention might be expected; and the aggravation of the world's sinfulness is sometimes cited as constituting such a crisis.* It is difficult, however, to make any definition of crisis, regarded as a moment in the general condition of mankind, apply to all or nearly all miracles. The view which we here urge finds the crisis or critical point to exist in the fact of pre-eminent human faith co-operating with the grace of God; and obviously the Incarnation has a peculiar and unique significance in this regard. Yet in a sense the emergence of genius of any kind constitutes a "crisis" in human life. It is when such genius is found in the things of faith that the conditions for miracle are propitious. But, in such a case, "intervention" is not a good metaphor; we suggest that "overflow" is at once a better symbol of experience and less open to philosophical objections.

4. Such a view, moreover, which considers miracle as mediated through human spirits when advanced to an exceptional degree of dependence upon God, is in keeping with the "incidental and unpremeditated" character of the miracles recorded in the Gospels. "It is difficult," says Dr. Gore,† "to state with any accuracy what function our Lord seems to desire His miracles to fulfil." One may doubt whether the question admits of a direct answer. But we are at least on firm ethical ground, and go far to turn the question, if we say that miracle was the recompense of faith.

5. Finally, the view which we urge is thoroughly "incarnational," and is so far in keeping with one of the most fundamental features of the Christian and Catholic outlook. It is obvious that the principle we are advocating applies in the case of the miracles of our Lord; for in His case the human spirit was wholly indwelt by, and taken up into, the divine. We may fairly think of miracle as "natural,"‡ when the perfect Mediator between God and Man walked this earth. Yet even here we shall detect a certain difference of emphasis, if our view be followed. Thus, stress is laid as much on our Lord's humanity as on His deity. His miracles are not acts in which God overrides, but in which He works through, the limiting conditions of the Incarnation. "My Father worketh hitherto," He says, "and I work." Moreover, this supernatural working is con-

* As by Dr. Gore in *Belief in God*, p. 245. † *Belief in God*, p. 258.

‡ *Cf.* Otto, *The Idea of the Holy*, p. 176: "These things are not 'miracles,' for they are powers of the Spirit, and so are as natural as our will itself is, with its control over our body."

ditioned by the relations with mankind which the Son has assumed in assuming human flesh. He can do no mighty work at Nazareth "because of their unbelief." Even the resurrection, that great vindication of the obedience of Jesus, is not to convince the Jews, but to restore the shaken faith of the Church. Moreover, there is much in Catholic belief and practice which sustains such a conclusion as we are advocating. If we consider, for example, a particular miracle like the Virgin Birth, it is significant that Christian art, and its sister, popular devotion, have never willingly isolated this event from the personality of Mary. The Nativity, that is to say—as in St. Luke's Gospel—is always closely conjoined with the Annunciation, the Incarnation with the praise of Mary. Both the Gospel evidence and the later instinct of the Church would seem to suggest that the human spirit of the Mother fulfilled a vital function in the miraculous process. Further, this view of miracle is "incarnational" also in a wider sense—in that sense in which we speak of the Church as the "extension" of the Incarnation. Regarded as an event in history, the Incarnation is that act of God by which a new quality of life, a new relation between God and man, emerged in evolution. He has come to dwell, not only "with" men, but also "in" them and they in Him; and Christians are re-begotten and re-born, the children of a new covenant, with the promise of seeing even "greater works" than those which marked the ministry of the incarnate Christ. He teaches us, in short, to expect miracle as a mark of the supernatural life which He imparts to the Church. In a quite simple sense, then, the Incarnation is seen to be the cause of what are called "ecclesiastical miracles." But there is a larger and deeper view yet for which the Incarnation is not only an event in time, producing results after it like any other event, but is also an "ideal" event, the apex of the cone up which all creation, and chiefly man its crown, traces out in manifold spirals its course to its true end in God. On this view the Incarnation has relations in time as much backwards as forwards. It is the ground, though only dimly guessed, of that fellowship with God which is the distinguishing mark of the Chosen People; and of those gropings after Him—acknowledgments of His witness of Himself—which argue the presence of His Spirit among the pagans of antiquity or the heathen of to-day. Here too, then, in so far as the grace of God is active, even outside the borders of the Christian covenant, its overflow into miracle must be considered possible. And whenever such cases are attested we shall but find yet another example of St. Paul's saying, that in Christ all things have their coherence.

E. G. Selwyn.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The Editor hopes to be abroad for three weeks in May, and would be glad to be spared correspondence with regard to the Journal until the end of the month. Any necessary correspondence relating to the June number should be addressed to the Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D., S.P.C.K., 7, Northumberland Avenue, W.C. 2, who is kindly seeing the number through the press.

We have received a copy of *A Book of Prayers for Communicants*, published by Mowbrays at 1s. 3d. net, and are glad to recommend it. One of the compilers has had a varied experience of pastoral work—in the slums, in Western Canada, and now in a country parish at home. It contains instructions on Prayer, Confirmation, Forgiveness, the Holy Communion, Sickness, etc., and devotions for each, chosen and compiled with much insight. We wish that, as the compilers have allowed themselves considerable liberty in editing the forms of some devotions, they had altered the word " inebriate " in the third line of the *Anima Christi* to " refresh " or some such equivalent. The teaching throughout is sound and clear, and we can recommend the book warmly.

The Rev. J. Dauglish, Lympstone Rectory, near Exeter, kindly sends us another rendering of the Latin poem on an infant dying unbaptized, which we printed last month. It is by John Donne, junior, and is printed in John Beresford's *Gossip of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, p. 85.

I dyed as soon as in the world I came,
Depriv'd of Baptism and without a name.
In Book of Life then nameless me record,
For my hope's only in Thy Name (O Lord).

SYNOPTICA.

MARK AND "Q"

I

The writer is anxious to commend to the reader an opinion which has been growing stronger in his mind of late.

If Mark represents the earliest Christian tradition which came from Jerusalem to Rome, and if Q represents the same tradition passing from Jerusalem to Antioch, it is natural to expect to find in Mark and Q two traditions which are independent and yet which will illustrate and corroborate one another.

The writer is of opinion that the extent to which they do so is scarcely, as yet, recognized, and he therefore begs you to lay before your readers certain passages of Mark and Q side by side.

It seems to him that it is scarcely possible to exaggerate the importance of this view, if it should be recognized to be correct.

If several of the original scenes and sayings have the testimony of this twofold evidence, if two independent and authentic accounts have come to us from the first generation of Christianity, we are like men who can focus what they see with both their eyes. We see what we see from two slightly different angles. The story stands out in a new perspective.

And where Mark and Q give, for example, the same saying of Jesus, the reason for their both giving it is not that Mark copied it from Q, or that Q borrowed it from Mark. The reason for their giving it is, that the Lord Himself said those words. The reason that one report differs slightly from the other is that Mark and Q are independent (as well as authentic) witnesses.

Mark iii. 20. And he cometh into a house. And the multitude cometh together again, so that they could not so much as eat bread.

21. And when his friends heard it, they went out to lay hold on him: for they said, He is beside himself.

Matt. ix. 32. And as they went forth, behold there was brought unto him a dumb man possessed with a devil.

33. And when the devil was cast out, the dumb man spake: and the multitude marvelled.

Also Matt. xii. 22, 23, and Luke xi. 14.

22. And the scribes which came down from Jerusalem said, He hath Beelzebub, and, By the prince of the devils casteth he out the devils.

23. And he called them unto him, and said unto them in parables, How can Satan cast out Satan?

24. And if a kingdom be divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand.

25. And if a house be divided against itself, that house will not be able to stand.

26. And if Satan hath risen up against himself, and is divided, he cannot stand, but hath an end.

Luke xi. 15. But some of them said, By Beelzebub the prince of the devils casteth he out devils.

17. But he knowing their thoughts said unto them,

Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and a house divided against a house falleth.

18. And if Satan also be divided against himself, how shall his kingdom stand?

Because ye say that I cast out devils by Beelzebub.

19. And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out? Therefore shall they be your judges?

20. But if I by the [Spirit] of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you.

27. But no one can enter into the house of the strong man, and spoil his *goods*.

Except he first bind the strong man; and then he will spoil his house. [Is. xlix. 24, σκῦλα; Is liii. 12, σκεύη.]

21. When a strong man fully armed guardeth his own court, his goods are in peace, but when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him his whole armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his *spoils*.

Luke xi. 24, Matt. xxii. 43. The unclean spirit when he is gone out of a man, passeth through waterless places, seeking rest;

And finding none, he saith, I will return into my house whence I came out;

25. And when he is come, he findeth it swept and garnished.

26. Then goeth he, and taketh to him seven other spirits more evil than himself; and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man becometh worse than the first.

Luke xi. 23, Matt. xii. 30. He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth.

28. Verily I say unto you, All their sin shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and their blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme :

29. But whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin:

30 Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit.

31. And there come his mother and his brethren; and standing without, they sent unto him, calling him.

32 And the multitude was sitting about him; and they say unto him, Behold thy mother and thy brethren without seek for thee.

33. And he answereth them, and saith, Who is my mother and my brethren ?

34. And looking round on them which sat round about him, he saith, Behold, my mother and my brethren!

35. For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.

Luke xii. 10, Matt. xii. 32. And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven.

Luke xi. 27. And it came to pass, as he said these things, a certain woman out of the multitude lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the breasts which thou didst suck. But he said, Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.

The reader will observe that St. Matthew has combined the two versions of the story of which Mark, and Luke who is here copying Q, give the independent versions.

From Q's version, which Matthew begins to copy at ix. 32, 33, and then copies and completes at xii. 22, we have the incident which brought the Pharisee hostility to this declaration of itself. He had worked a miracle which they could not gainsay upon a dumb man.

St. Mark gives the feeling of insecurity and doubt among " his friends." It is not certain that Jesus is sane. St. Mark gives also a sign of the rising suspicion of the Jews. Scribes have been sent from Jerusalem to observe Him. Mark and Q agree almost word for word as to the defence of Jesus. But Q gives the double illustration of the argument: " The spirit returning to his house," as well as " The strong man guarding his house "; a double illustration which seems to have been " in the manner " of Jesus, for we find it many times.

Mark enables us to see what is incorrect in Q's report of the saying about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.

" All their sins shall be forgiven unto *the sons of men* " has given rise to a misquotation introducing words about blasphemy against the *Son of man.*

And again, where Q left the cry of " a certain woman out of the multitude " an inconsequent and incoherent interruption, Mark gives us the cause of this " certain woman " so " lifting her voice."

Q had not told us, but Mark tells us: " there came his mother, and standing without (she) sent unto him, calling him."

So the memory of one of the most critical moments in the story of the hostility of official Judaism to Jesus, and of the adoption of His cause by the disciples comes to us by this twofold tradition. Christians very early realized the decisiveness of that moment. It is such a scene as we should have expected to live in Christian memories. And it has lived for us in two evidences, one of which remembers how Jesus " looked round on

them which sat round about him." Someone is still remembering there the look that was in Jesus' face. The other evidence remembers that shrill voice of the woman in the crowd and her homely words. These evidencies of the forties, fifties, sixties, are independent, and supplement one another. They converge towards the year A.D. 30. They bring us very near to seeing that scene and hearing those sayings. And two points, at least, may be noted by a modern reader. One is the absence of any emphasis on the miracle our Lord has done. It is mentioned without any sort of protestation that it is a miracle. It is simply taken for granted that it is so, by Jesus, and by His friends, and by His enemies.

The other is the quietness of that stupendous claim: "Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother," or was it, "My brethren are those which hear the word of God and do it"?

II

The Mission and Return of the Disciples

Matthew x. raises many questions. Was Q a document which would have included such words as verses 5 and 23? "Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans. . . . Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come."

St. Luke has not the words. And yet he has the air of having seen them and refused to copy them. So much of this passage as he copies from Q is found in Luke ix. 57–x. 24. And just before these thirty verses of Q, he has a passage telling (ix. 51–56) how Jesus sent messengers, and they "entered into a village of the Samaritans." Then follow the thirty verses. And after them St. Luke has put (x. 25–37) the story of the Good Samaritan. The framing of this passage of Q suggests what St. Luke found in it and omitted. Matthew's inclusion and Luke's omission are alike suggestive here. Again, Matt. x. 25 has "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub . . ."—an allusion to the scene which he has given, as it happens, two chapters later: "This man doth not cast out devils but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils."

St. Luke also gives that scene in the chapter following this Mission and Return. Yet it is clear he does so to introduce it, with its casting out of the devil which was *dumb*, as an appropriate companion to the lesson about prayer (xi. 1–13), and Matthew seems to have preserved in his x. 25 an indication of the original Q order. Matt. x. 25 followed Matt. xii. 24, and Luke x. followed Luke xi. 15.

The sayings given (in Matt. x. 26–33) about Persecution are part of a series which neither Matt. nor Luke has preserved in its original order or completeness. Q may have placed them in this Mission Scene, but St. Mark suggests that they belong to a later time.

Luke ix. 57. And a certain man said unto him, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.

58. And Jesus said unto him, The foxes have holes and the birds of the heaven have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.

59. And he saith unto another, Follow me. But he said, Lord, suffer me first to bury my father.

60. But he said unto him, Follow me:

Mark vi. 6. And he went round about the villages teaching.

7. And he called unto him the twelve, and began to send them forth by two and two; and he gave them authority over the unclean spirits;

[*Cf.* Mark vii. 27. And he said unto her, Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs.]

8. And he charged them that they should take nothing for their journey, save a staff only; no bread, no wallet, no money in their purse; 9. but to go shod with sandals: and, said he, put not on two coats.

10. And he said unto them, Whereso-ever ye enter into a house, there abide until ye depart thence.

11. And whatsoever place shall not receive you, and they hear you not, as ye go forth thence, shake off the dust that is under your feet for a testimony unto them.

12. And they went out, and preached that men should repent.

13. And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.

[*Cf.* Mark ix. 1. And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There be some here of them which stand by, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they shall see the kingdom of God come with power.]

Mark. viii. 34. And he called unto him the multitude with his disciples, and said unto them, If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me.

35. For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it.

and leave the dead to bury their own dead.

[And he sent out his disciples] two and two. . . .

Luke x. 2. And he said unto them, The harvest is plenteous, but the labourers are few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he send forth labourers into his harvest.

Matt. x. 5. Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans,

6. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

7. And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand.

8. Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give.

10. Carry no purse, no wallet, no shoes: and salute no man on the way.

Luke x. 5. And into whatsoever house ye shall enter, first say, Peace be to this house,

6. And if the house be worthy, your peace shall rest upon it: but if not, it shall return to you again.

7. And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the labourer is worthy of his food.

Go not from house to house.

8. And into whatsoever city ye enter and they receive you, say unto them,

9. The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.

10. But into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go out into the streets thereof and say,

11. Even the dust of your city that cleaveth to our feet we do wipe off against you: howbeit know this, that the king-dom of God is come nigh.

12. Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom, than for that city.

Matt. x. 16. Behold I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves.

23. But when they persecute you in this city, flee into the next: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come.

24. A disciple is not above his master. nor a servant above his lord (Luke vi. 40).

25. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord.

If they have called the master of the house Belzeebub, how much more them of his household?

36. For what doth it profit a man to gain the whole world and forfeit his life ?

37. For what should a man give in exchange for his life?

38. For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of man also shall be ashamed of him, when he cometh in the glory of the Father with the holy angels.

Mark xiii. 9. But take heed to yourselves: for they shall deliver you up to councils; and in synagogues shall ye be beaten; and before governors and kings shall ye stand for my sake, for a testimony unto them.

10. And the gospel must first be preached unto all the nations.

11. And when they lead you to judgement, and deliver you up, be not anxious beforehand what ye shall speak: but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost.

12. And brother shall deliver up brother to death, and the father his child; and " children shall rise up against parents " and cause them to be put to death. . . .

Mark x. 29. Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or mother, or father, or children, or lands, for my sake, and for the gospel's sake, but he shall receive a hundredfold now in this time, houses and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life.

[Mark ix. 50. Salt is good: but if the salt have lost its saltness, wherewith will ye season it ? Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another.]

Mark vi. 30. And the apostles gather themselves together unto Jesus; and they told him all things, whatsoever they had taught.

31. And he saith unto them, Come ye yourselves apart . . . .

40. He that heareth you heareth me; and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me; and he that rejecteth me rejecteth him that sent me. . . .

Matt. x. 32, Luke xii. 7. Every one who shall confess me before men, him will I confess before [the angels of] God.

33. But whosoever will deny me before men, him will I also deny before [the angels of] God.

Luke xii. 11. And when they bring you before the synagogues, and the rulers, and the authorities, be not ye anxious how ye shall answer or what ye shall say:

12. For the Holy Spirit shall teach you in that hour what ye ought to say.

Matt. x. 34. Think ye that I am come to give peace in the earth ? I tell you, Nay: but rather division. For there shall be from henceforth five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three.

35. They shall be divided, father against son, and son against father; mother against daughter, and daughter against her mother; mother in law against her daughter in law, and daughter in law against her mother in law.

36. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household.

37. If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, he cannot be my disciple.

38. Whosoever doth not bear his own cross and come after me, cannot be my disciple.

39. He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.

Matt. v. 13, Luke xiv. 34. Salt is good: but if the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned ?

It is fit neither for the land nor for the dunghill: men cast it out.

He that hath ears to hear let him hear.

Luke x. 17. And the [disciples] returned with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto us in thy name.

18. And he said unto them, I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven.

19. Behold I have given you authority to " tread upon serpents " and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall in any wise hurt you.

20. Howbeit in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rejoice that your names are written in heaven.

21. At that season he . . . said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding,

Mark ix. 7. And there came a voice out of the cloud, This is my beloved Son: hear ye him.

Mark vi. 31. Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place and rest a while.

For there were many coming and going, and they had no leisure so much as to eat.

32. And they went away in the boat to a desert place apart.

33. And the people saw them going, and many knew them, and they ran there together on foot from all the cities, and outwent them.

34. And he came forth and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them, because they were as "sheep not having a shepherd": and he began to teach them many things.

and didst reveal them unto babes: Yea, Father, for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight.

22. All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.

Matt. xi. 28. Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

29. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls.

30. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.

Luke x. 23. [And turning to his disciples, he said privately]

Blessed are the eyes which see the things which ye see.

24. For I say unto you that many prophets and [righteous men] have desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not, and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not.

If we follow St. Matthew rather than St. Luke, Mark and Q had each of them one account of a Mission and Return of the disciples. St. Luke's final editor appears to have made room for the Marcan account by postulating a second mission of the Seventy or Seventy-two to whom he applies the Q account, which was already in the first edition of St. Luke. St. Matthew gives, as belonging to this mission, warnings of a persecution (from Q) which in Mark are found in connexion with the presage, by Jesus, of His own death. And, again, others which are found in the apocalypse of Mark xiii.

The restoration of Q from Matthew and Luke is, of course, very uncertain. But it is singular to find Matthew bringing together x. 23, "Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the son of man be come," and x. 33, "whosoever will deny me before men . . ."; and, similarly, Mark bringing together viii. 38, "whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words . . .," and ix. 1, "Verily, I say unto you, there be some here of them which stand by. . . ." Matt. x. 23 can scarcely have stood elsewhere in Q than in this Mission story.

The two accounts of the Return of the disciples have diverged far enough, and yet, when the mind is looking for an explanation of the great passage, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth . . .," being followed (as Matthew suggests) by the passage, "Come unto me, all ye that labour" (Matt. xi. 25 and 28), and the words of Luke x. 23=Matt. xi. 28, "Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see," spoken to the disciples this of prayer, and of speech to the multitude, and of speech to the disciples, with its words of compassion and its restfulness, could scarcely find a more appropriate time and place than is found in Mark vi. 31–34. Put together the language of Q and the scene of Mark, and there disappears that seeming inappropriateness of the words "Come unto me, all . . ." spoken to a world of men. The sudden change of audience seems to have caused them to be omitted by St. Luke, and caused him to

add, in passing from the prayer to the saying to the disciples, his editorial words (x. 23, " And turning to the disciples, he said privately "). It is well for us that Matthew has blindly followed Q, and saved for us those three verses. We could ill have spared his xi. 28, 29, 30.

J. M. C. CRUM.

NOTES

1. THE STYLE OF OUR LORD'S DISCOURSES

CONSERVATIVE writers have tried to meet the argument that the utterances of our Lord as given in the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel cannot both be authentic by urging the different audiences to which they were addressed. Thus Bishop Westcott says the discourses in St. John " are not (so to speak) average examples of the Lord's popular teaching, but words called out by special circumstances," and emphasizes the importance of the fact that, with some exceptions, the discourses " were all held at Jerusalem, the centre of the true or false theocratic life " (*Comm. on St. John*, p. lix). The argument is still current, for Canon A. W. Robinson, in his *The Christ of the Gospels* (S.C.M., 1924), says: " If there were visits corresponding with the great feasts, it is scarcely likely that He would have employed exactly the same language in His appeals to cultivated theologians that would have been suited to the peasants of Galilee." The argument seems to me valueless.

In the first place, we must remove from the inquiry all the discourses addressed to the disciples, who form a third division identical in their mental and spiritual apprehension neither with the simple peasants of Galilee nor with the cultivated theologians of Jerusalem. We note, however, that the long discourse to the disciples in Matt. x. is completely Synoptist in style, and the discourses in John xiv.-xvi. are completely Johannine.

If we now examine the Galilean discourses and instructions in St. Mark i.–ix (from x. onwards we are in Judæa) we find that with hardly an exception they are addressed, if not to the disciples, then to the scribes or Pharisees, or both. In iii. 22 the scribes have come down from Jerusalem. In ii. 19–22 John's disciples are addressed, but with them the Pharisees are associated. In fact, the only body of teaching recorded by the Second Gospel as given to " the peasants of Galilee " is the collection of parables in chapter iv., and these, according to verse 12, are intended not to be understood by the multitude. In chapter x. and onwards we are in " theological " and " theocratic " Judæa, but the teaching is the same in style. The so-called Johannine fragment of Matt. xi. 27 (" All things have been delivered," etc.) is uttered in Galilee.

But that for which we look in vain in St. Mark—discourses delivered to non-theological hearers—is actually found in St. John. The whole of chapter vi. is concerned with the Galilean multitudes who were fed in the wilderness. In chapter iv. Jesus discourses to a Samaritan woman. Nicodemus, indeed, is a ruler, but in most other passages before xiii. where the interlocutors are defined they are " the Jews," without further differentiation.

Surely the *onus probandi* rests with those who maintain a difference in mental attitude between Galilee and Judæa. The Galilean ministry was mainly among crowds in and around Capernaum and the other lake-

side towns. What evidence is there for any distinction between the people of Capernaum and those of Jerusalem, so that the former can be styled "simple," the latter subtle and theologically minded? Professor Torrey, in the *Harvard Theological Review* (1923, p. 310), in a most illuminating article says: "We find it convenient to fence off Palestine from the rest of the Hellenistic world, when we are speaking of its (conjectured) philosophy of the Greek period, as though it had lived its own untouched life. There was, in fact, no such isolation." Philo and IV. Maccabees are as likely to be characteristic of Palestinian-Jewish thought as the Mishna. The connection between Egypt and Palestine was specially close.

If Dr. Torrey is right in taking down the fence between "Palestinian" and "Hellenistic" Judaism—and Jewish scholars, at least, will agree with him—we are equally justified in denying that a fence ever existed between Galilee and Judæa. Galilee, it should be remembered, bore the brunt of the fighting in the war with the Romans, and after the destruction of Jerusalem it became the centre of theological Judaism, which found here a congenial home.

The current of recent research is flowing so strongly in the direction of a more conservative view of the Fourth Gospel, that it is a pity if the process is hindered by faulty arguments.

W. K. L. C.

---

2. THE OPENING OF THE SECOND GOSPEL

That we have lost the original ending of this Gospel everybody knows, and a presumption arises that we have lost the opening also, for a roll would be as likely to be torn at one end as at the other, as each would get an equal amount of wear from the stick to which it was attached. Dr. Streeter writes: "There is no difficulty in supposing that the original copy of Mark, especially if the Gospel was written for the Church of Rome about A.D. 65, almost immediately lost its conclusion. The two ends of a roll would always be the most exposed to damage; the beginning ran the greater risk, but, in a book rolled from both ends, the conclusion was not safe" (*The Four Gospels*, p. 338). It is at least conceivable that ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ were the last words at the bottom of the roll, and that the remaining verses came away, partially or entirely, with the stick. Did the same thing occur at the beginning? The Second Gospel begins awkwardly and abruptly, to say the least, while the other three begin naturally and easily; indeed, they each begin twice—Matthew has quite a good beginning at i. 18, Luke at i. 5 and iii. 1, John at i. 6, but Mark starts with a kind of anacoluthon. Granted that he is a less polished writer than Matthew or Luke (and Matthew has plainly modified his expressions in verses 4 and 5), yet the phrasing does not look like that of Mark, who never quotes the Old Testament on his own initiative, but only when recording someone else's use of it.

There is a further point to be noticed. Matthew begins using Mark and Q in chapter iii. He begins his use of the new sources with the awkward expression "and in those days," as if the Baptist's ministry began on the return of Joseph from Egypt. The expression occurs in Mark viii. 1, and also in i. 9. As Matthew iii. 1 is based on Mark i. 4, it looks very much as if ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις had originally begun the verse, referring to something else that had occurred. The

verses which precede (2 and 3) plainly cannot have been there originally, for apart from the confusion of Malachi with Isaiah it is hardly likely that Mark would *begin* with an Old Testament text, as if he were preaching a sermon. The writer suggests that Matthew had the original Mark before him, and that it *may* be embodied in Matthew i.-ii., and possibly even in Matthew xxviii. 16-20. Then wear and tear caused the loss of the outer edges of the roll, and all that remained was Mark i. 4 to xvi. 8. It is conceivable that there may have been variant beginnings as well as endings, but that which has survived looks like a crude but well-meaning attempt to lead up to verse 4. Verse 1 is the title of the chapter, as it were, and then follow, outwardly enough, two of those proof-texts which we know the earliest Christians made such good use of, prefaced by the conventional formula and a confusion between two prophets. We can never be certain that Matthew used our Mark, whether it be necessary or not to postulate on Ur- Marcus. It is at least conceivable that he used a fuller and truer edition than that which has come down to us.

R. S. T. Haselhurst, B D.

---

3. THE NEW LIDDELL AND SCOTT

The following notes may be useful to students of the Greek Testament, as showing where the latest edition of our standard lexicon amplifies and corrects our knowledge. LSI=the seventh edition, LS2=the new edition (Part I A='Αποβαίνω, 1925), MM=Milligan-Moulton's *Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament* 1914—.

1. ἀγαπάω "sometimes can hardly be distinguished" from φιλέω, LS1; "the two are interchanged," LS2.

2. ἀγαπητός is given="beloved" in LS1 as first sense. In LS2 it is derived from the secondary sense of ἀγαπάω, and therefore has as its primary meaning "that with which one must be content," so "only" (son, etc.). See Mark i. 11, ix. 7, xii. 6. *Cf.* Prof. C. H. Turner in *J.T.S.*, January, 1926, pp. 113 *ff.*

3. ἀδελφός. LS1 says: "a brother, or generally, a near kinsman." LS2: "brother"; and in a secondary sense "kinsman," for which it gives no references but Gen. xiii. 8 (Abram to Lot) "we are brethren," Ex. ii. 11 "ye are brethren," and similar LXX passage. No support is given to the theory that the "brethren" of our Lord were cousins, which might have seemed plausible to one consulting LS1.

4. ἀδόκιμος. As "not standing the test" of LS1 disappears in LS2, it is better not to read the original sense of the root, and therefore an eschatological reference, into the adjective in passages like 1 Cor. ix. 27, 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

5. ἀετός. LS2, which gives N.T. references fully, does not mention "vulture" as a rendering. Only once in the O.T., according to Brown-Driver-Griggs' Lexicon, is *nĕshĕr* (always=ἀετός in LXX) necessarily translated "vulture," namely Micah i. 16. May we revert to the old explanation that "the eagles" are the Roman standards in Matt. xxiv. 28, Luke xvii. 37, as in Plutarch ?

6. ἀήρ, "the lower air . . . opp. to αἰθήρ, the pure upper air," LS1. This distinction is now given up. "In Hom. and Hes. always mist, haze,

not (as Aristarch.) lower air," LS2. In Eph. ii. 2 therefore *ἀήρ* means exactly our "air," as in later Greek literature. There is no contrast between the lower and upper air.

7. *ἀθετέω*. The astrological usage cited by LS2 (not in MM) from Vettius Valens—one planet is said to "cancel," "render ineffectual" another—throws light on a passage like Luke vii. 30, *τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν*.

8. *ἄϊδιος*. Interesting because sometimes compared with *αἰώνιος*. LS2 has a new definition: "distinguished from *αἰώνιος* as *everlasting* from *timeless*, but distinguished from *ἀείζωος* as *eternal* (without beginning or end) from *everliving*."

9. *αἰώνιος*. Any light on this word is welcome. LS2 quotes from the *Corpus Hermeticum* where, applied to a gymnasiarch, it means "holding an office for life." LS2 and MM quote the Rosetta stone (B.C. 196), where Ptolemy V is termed *αἰωνόβιος*. *Cf.* the titles of the Roman Emperors. No wonder the Evangelists preferred *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*.

10. *ἀκροβυστία*. An Alexandrian form of *ἀκροποσθία*=prepuce. MM suppose a rare word *βύστρα*. LS2 more satisfactorily derives from Hebrew *bosheth*=shame.

11. *ἄμφοδον*. "Any road that leads round a place or block of buildings," LS1. LS2 merely "street." R.V. in Mark xi. 4 has "in the open street."

12. *ἀνάμνησις*. In view of the great controversies which have raged round *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, 1 Cor. xi. 24, it is worth noticing that LS2 translates Lysias 2. 39, *ἀναμνήσεις θυσιῶν*, by "reminders to the gods of sacrifices offered," whereas LS1 has "recollection of vows to pay sacrifices." A meaning is added in LS2: "memorial sacrifice, LXX Nu. x. 10, *cf.* Luke xxii. 19."

W. K. L. C.

A NON-JUROR'S LATIN POEMS

I

ABOUT a year ago the writer picked up a tiny volume (for a modest 3s. 6d.) formerly in the possession of the late Dr. W. D. Macray. Although the chief interest of the book to readers of THEOLOGY will be the contents and the witness it bears to the faith and practice of the non-jurors, nevertheless a brief bibliographical note may not be out of place.

II

The first edition was issued in 1696, with the title: *Oblectamenta pia, ab L. S., Presbytero rusticante in agro Devoniensi. Londini. Prostant apud H. Bonwicke ad insigne Rubri Leonis in Cœmiterio Paulino*, 1696. Dr. Macray (from whose MS. notes these particulars are taken) saw a copy of this edition in the library at Longleat, Wilts, in April, 1882. This copy had a presentation inscription to Bishop Ken ". . . episcope Bathon. et Wellen., huncce libellulum (*οὐδὲ κακὸν μέγα*) D.D.D. ex amatoribus amantissimus, e filiis obsequentissimus, e cultoribus officiosissimus devotissimusque, adquodis amoris, obedientiæ honoris, munus obeundum paratissimus. Timotheus✠"

The Rev. J. E. Jackson, who was librarian at Longleat, had inserted a MS. note suggesting that the inscription was "most probably written by the Rev. Timothy Cruso, De Foe's schoolfellow, from whom he borrowed

the name of Robinson Cruso." Dr. Macray, however, maintains that "it is almost certain that the inscription is by the author of the book; that *Timotheus* means that he was Ken's 'own son in the faith'; and that the cross is simply the emblem of that faith."

The second edition, of which a copy lies before me, was printed in 1716: *Oblectamenta Pia :/sive,/Sacra Modulamina./nempe/Rhythmi Divini Festivique./In Gratiam Juventutis./Editio altera; . . ./Magis Spectat Deus . . ./Tho. de Kemp, L. 1. c. 15./Ab Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Sacer/dote, Anachoreta./Iscæ Dunmoniorum :/Exudebat, et Venales prostant apud /Philippum Bishop.* MDCCXVI. Dr. Macray had only seen one other copy of this edition—in the library at Bicton, Devon, in 1848. That copy contained the author's name, Lewis Southcombe, rector of Rose Ash, Devon (a non-juror), who gave it to John Rolle, Esq., in 1729. "For thirty-two years, since I saw that copy," writes Dr. Macray, "I have been on the lookout for the book!" He finally bought the copy I now have at an auction in London of books from the library of the late Earl of Clare in Devonshire.

Lewis Southcombe was born October 15, 1653, and died February 22, 1732/3. He graduated at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1674, and was incumbent of Rose Ash for above fifty-seven years. Bonwicke appears to have published at any rate two other items for Lewis Southcombe—"*A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the Reverend Mr. John Culme,*" and "*A Sermon Preached at the Baptism of one of Riper Years,* (*aged* 33), *Aug.* 18, 1700"—Mrs. Ann Hartnoll, as appears from the Rose Ash register.

Inside the cover of Dr. Macray's copy, in what he maintains is Southcombe's own writing, and identical with that of the inscription in Longleat copy of the first edition, are the words: "Quippe quod *μέγα βιβλίον μέγα κακόν* ait Callimachus apud Athenæum."

III

The book contains sixty-nine pieces, covering the red-letter days of the B.C.P., and including one headed "Carolus I. Rex Angliæ, Legum, & Religionis Martyr, Jan. 30. 1648." The rest are prayers, meditations, etc., of various kinds. Of these I give three in full:

ALTARE: SIVE, S. EUCHARISTIA

I

Orbem hunc qui condidisti,
Cunctis Leges qui fixisti,
Credo Tibi qui dixisti
Nobis, *Hoc est Corpus meum,*
Credo, & adoro Deum.

II

Teneo Rem, sed nescio *Modum,*
Hoc Mysterium, huncce Nodum
Solvere quod nullus queo,
Credo, & relinquo *Deo.*

III

At *Præsentiam realem*
Credo Sacramento talem,
Qualem *Jesu* intendisti,
Qualem Deus voluisti.

IV

Ultra juvat quid scutari?
Mallem ego adorare,
Cum Sanctis Te *glorificare,*
Te laudare, Te *Amare.*

V

Credo ego quæ dixisti,
Amo ego quæ fecisti,
Credo, Amo, Laudo, Colo:
Ulterius *scrutari nolo.*

VI

Tantum oro Te benignum
Jesus Christum, fac me *dignum*
Mysteriis tremendis hisce;
O *Mens,* ut sic fias, disce.

VII

Ut Te, Jesu, *gustem, tangam*
Sanctè, dignè, *culpas* plangam.
Fidem da non temeratam,
Pœnitentiam tibi gratam,
Et da *Vitam* emendatam.

VIII

Cor contritum, *Cor* devotum,
Dilectionem erga totum
Mundum, & Affectûs Motum.

IX

Me sic totum Tibi dedam
O sic *bibam ;* O sic *edam,*
Lætabundum & recedam.

SACERDOS

I

Sancte, *Præco* Legis Dei,
Nuncie Salutis meæ,
Præco sancte bonæ *Spei.*

II

O Quis te non *veneratur ?*
Tui and quis non *Amator ?*
Et quis læta non precatur ?

III

Nuncius cunctis gratus oris,
Gratus domi, gratus foris.
Nuncius *Dei* qui *Amoris.*

IV

Vitæ *Viam* qui monstrabis,
Et qui primus tu *intrabis,*
O quot sanctos Deo dabis ?

V

Cuncta tua tibi donem,
Qui das sacram *Concionem ;*
Et (meam post *Confessionem*)
Tuam Absolutionem

VI

Te, qui soles exhibere
Corpus Christi, pro me flere,
Mecum soles condolere,
Amen, sanctè, piè, verè.

SIGNUM CRUCIS

I

Amo, Jesu, *signum Crucis,*
Horâ *Noctis,* Horâ Lucis:
Frontem, Pectus, Cruce Tero:
Crucem *Fronte,* Mente Gero.

II

Signum duco tunc cum oro;
Signum duco cum *Laboro ;*
Amor, *Jesu,* in Te nixi
Amat signum Crucifixi.

III

Monstro, *Crucis* ducens *signum*
Pectus meum in Indignum,
Fidem, Spem, Amorem meam
In *Te,* Per *Te,* ob *Te* deum

IV

In Te Crucifixe Credo :
Tibi me, & mea *dedo*
Gloriâ Te Fruar Jube
Signis sine, sine *Nube.*

MAURICE FROST.

CORRESPONDENCE

Landmarks in the Struggle between Science and Religion.

SIR,—Perhaps you will allow me the courtesy of an observation upon the notice of my book in the March issue of your Journal. In it the reviewer states that " we heartily wish that it were in our power to praise *the main portion* (italics mine) of this interesting book, but we by no means feel that we can do so," and this somewhat pontifical judgment is based on the assertion that " the review of the Fathers is not adequate." One chapter out of twelve—and the scale of the book did not permit of more—deals with the Early Church Fathers and Science, and is devoted almost entirely to a short review of a selected work of each of four of the Fathers, including the hitherto untranslated Hexæmeron of Gregory of Nyssa, for the purpose of showing that the rather sweeping criticisms passed by A. D. White in

his classical work *The Warfare of Science with Theology* were not completely justified. Most of the well-known points to which the reviewer draws attention in the later part of his review, in expansion of his judgment, had already been dealt with by me in a section on The Doctrine of Special Creation in an earlier book, entitled *The Spiritual Interpretation of Nature ;* a cross-reference, however, might have been given. Surely, also, nowadays, it might be presumed that the occupant of a chair in any reputable institution of learning has " a wide acquaintance " with his subject.—Faithfully,

J. Y. Simpson.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society. Vol. v. Nos. 2-3.

The larger half of this number is taken up with a collection in Arabic of sayings and proverbs now current in Palestine: these have been gathered together from the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, evidently with infinite pains, by Stephen H. Stephen, who adds some translations and useful comments. The proverbs serve to show how near the Syrian peasant still lives to his animal friends, with which he shares often his home and food (*cf.* 2 Sam. xii. 1-4), and which he believes to be endowed with special gifts of reason and understanding, readily placed at his disposal in moments of difficulty; Balaam's ass is no isolated instance of this. Most of the proverbs deal, as might be expected, with the ass, the camel and the dog. No good word is said for the latter. One proverb, an amusing one, may be quoted to illustrate this: " When the mother-in-law loves her daughter-in-law the dog will enter paradise " (*cf.* Rev. xxii. 15). Thus the dog remains throughout the ages the despised scavenger of the East. There is indeed no favourable mention of the dog in the Bible, except Tobit v. 16, xi. 4, where a pet dog is the constant companion of Tobias. It seems hardly worth while to have recorded the obscene proverbs. A Latin version is provided for the most objectionable. It is terrible to read that the nameless vice which fell under the Deuteronomic curse (Deut. xxvii. 21) is practised freely and without shame by young Kurds and Persians, though condemned by Arabs and Turks. The proverb " The hyena becomes a lion by night " is interesting in view of Dr. Burney's remarks on the habits of that animal, *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*, pp. 40-43.

S. Tolkowsky, in his article " Gideon's 300," is at pains to show that " Judges vii. and viii. is history and not legend," and that Gideon in his reduction of his force from 32,000 to 300 was only acting as any great general would have done in similar circumstances. In support of this contention he gives numerous instances of the use of 300 men as a capable fighting force, from the 300 Spartans of Leonidas to the Fascist militia of present-day Italy, with its cohorts of three centuries each. But, assuming historical fact lies behind the narrative in its present form, is it certain that Gideon reduced his force from 32,000 to 300 ? Judges vi. 34 relates the muster of Gideon's clan, which according to vii. 23 is *reinforced after the encounter* by other clans, all joining in the pursuit of the Midianites; vi. 35, which relates the muster of Manasseh and other tribes, looks like a later insertion to pave the way for vii. 2-8—the " reduction " story. It seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that there are two accounts interwoven in the present narrative. Lack of space forbids further discussion of this point. See Cook in *Hastings' D.B.* ii. 171; Burney, *Judges*, p. 179 *ff.*

REVIEW

THE NATURE OF RELIGION. Gifford Lectures for 1924 and 1925. By W. P. Paterson, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton. 15s.

Professor Taylor in his address to the first Anglo-Catholic Congress said: "We may feel convinced that, when a great modern Christian philosopher arises, he will not be one of these solitary souls, but an active member of the historic community of Christians, profiting in his inner life to the full by the organized Sacraments and devotions and living traditions of the great brotherhood of the Christian life."

Dr. Paterson's modesty would certainly shrink from the epithet "great," and we might hesitate as to whether his particular doctrinal position is that of the "historic community," but at least it is refreshing to find a Gifford Lecturer relying upon the contribution of historic Christianity to the problems of philosophy, instead of bestowing upon us from some Olympian height his gracious permission to carry on for the present. Too many of them have been inclined to say, "After all, there *is* something to be said, you know, for orthodoxy," and then to pass on, miracles of broad-mindedness. It is comforting to find a lecturer who can declare, "After all, orthodoxy has something to say."

Dr. Paterson's Lectures are very hard to classify. We expect a set of "Giffords" to tackle one special philosophical problem, but Dr. Paterson has no particular problem, and is not always concerned with Philosophy. His title is a broad one, and he brings very many good things into his net. Psychology, Anthropology, Comparative Religion all come tumbling in, full of colour and animation. Dr. Paterson's treatment, too, is as unmethodical as it is charming. Do not be misled by classificatory A's and B's into thinking these are lectures. They are more like vigorous and scholarly conversation, with now and then a touch of the gifted preacher. Dr. Paterson is really taking stock of the whole situation of religious knowledge at the present moment, and that can only be done by touching upon the myriad aspects of the subject, and not letting any of them carry one too far.

His treatment is sane and firm; his judgment well-balanced and fair. Any feeling one might have of insufficient treatment comes rather from the plan of the book than any fault of the writer. Thus one might feel that philosophical problems are kept rather on one side. Dr. Paterson seems to think it enough to prove Christianity to be in accordance with natural and widespread instincts. He sees the moral strength of Theism,

and not the metaphysical case for Pantheism; he does not seem to feel the pressure of speculative problems like the relation of Time to Eternity, or that of God's Omnipotence to our freedom, and he "cannot feel much respect" for Mr. Bradley's difficulty about the personality of God. But this may be all due simply to the postponement of such problems to a second series on "The Truth of Religion."

His incursions into ecclesiastical history, though on the whole very fair, do not perhaps lend themselves to his rather compressed summaries. There is much to be said for Justification by Faith, but it is going a little far to say that the Roman Church "has exercised an extensive and penetrating influence on conduct by means of . . . threatened penalties and promised recompense," while "the Reformers were content to rely for moral results on dynamic forces." After all, the Roman Church produced Fénélon as well as Bossuet in the famous dispute on the motive for loving God, and it was a Roman who wrote, "My God, I love Thee, not because I hope for heaven thereby"; on the other side, it will hardly be said that Protestantism has been shy about appealing to hell-fire, and anyone who reads Froude's *Edward VI.* may be led to wonder how far the "dynamic forces" responded to the first appeal of the Reformers.

Such incidental criticisms are only made by putting oneself with an effort outside the trend of Dr. Paterson's book. From inside one rejoices, as a Christian, at the courage and cheerfulness of it all, especially at the half-prophetic hopes of the closing pages.

F. H. Brabant.

NOTICES

Conway Morgan. By C. Linda Morgan. Longmans. 7s. 6d.

Arthur Conway Osborne Morgan, son of the well-known Dr. Morgan, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, was born in 1885. He went to Winchester in 1899, and to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1903; there he won the Chancellor's Medal for English Verse and became President of the Union. After a year spent in Germany and France he embraced a legal life and was called to the Bar in 1909. He accepted a commission at the outbreak of war and fell leading his men in an attack on the Hohenzollern Redoubt, October 13, 1915.

This bare narrative of facts will recall to many a vivid, brilliant and elusive personality, whose influence, already potent during his brief life, would probably have left its mark on England by this time if he had lived. In 1914 Morgan was engaged in an intense study both of law and human nature, in order to fit himself for a political career. He was widely recognized as one of the coming men, for to brilliant gifts of intellect and character he added unusual powers of fascination and leadership.

A few points may be emphasized to show the special interest of the Memoir to our readers. Viscount Wolmer reveals that "He penned the first draft of the Enabling Bill, which I took to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who said he thought it very ably done, but that he must appoint a Committee to consider the whole question. . . . The final draft of the Committee did not much differ from it. . . ." In his busiest time Conway Morgan would spend one evening a week at the Cambridge Settlement in Camberwell. He gave up much time to the personal care of young prisoners. "At the beginning of the War when the question was put to him whether only sons should go to the War he simply said, 'God gave His only Son.'"

To some who knew him slightly and had few, if any, heroes he was the object of unabashed hero-worship. What friendship with him must have meant can be imagined. To his mother and sisters he was always a lover, lavishing on them the treasure of an undivided heart. We are indeed grateful to them for sharing with others the sacred memories of their great love, and of a sorrow which has been transmuted to joy.

W. K. L. Clarke.

Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus from the Psychological and Psychoanalytic Point of View. By Georges Berguer. English trans. by E. S. and V. W. Brooks. Pp. viii, 332. London. 1925.

This is an excellent English translation of a work which has attracted a good deal of attention in Switzerland. The title may repel some readers by a suggestion of the kind of pseudo-psychological absurdity perpetrated by such writers as Swisher. The present book is, however, a very different kind of work by a very different type of author. Dr. Berguer is a lecturer in psychology at Geneva University, and the pastor of a village near by. He combines psychological learning with reverence for, and scholarly knowledge of, the Gospels. He does not claim that modern psychology can do more than throw light on some parts of the Gospel narrative, so he adopts as his title *Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus*. The author modestly disclaims any definite conclusions, but hopes that his work may make it possible to understand a little better the more obscure parts of the Gospel history.

His outlook is that of Liberal Protestantism. He regards the Virgin birth as a legend to be understood by psychological study of the narratives of the births of heroes. The physical miracles are illusory reports of the one true marvel of the impression produced on His hearers by the moral personality of Jesus. The chapter on the death of Jesus concludes with a spirited defence on psychological grounds of the Protestant against the Roman Catholic ideal of sainthood.

With many such parts of Dr. Berguer's work, the orthodox will find themselves in sharp disagreement. It would be a pity, however, if this disagreement prevented them from giving the book the attention it deserves. It is an approach to the life of Jesus from an angle which is almost entirely new. It is difficult to suppose that there are any readers who will not find many parts of the history of the Gospels illuminated by Dr. Berguer's able psychological enquiry.

R. H. Thouless.

ANTE-NICENE EXEGESIS OF THE GOSPELS. Vol. II. By Harold Smith, D.D. S.P.C.K. 1926. 7s. 6d. net. (Translations of Christian Literature, Series VI.)

All students will welcome the second volume of Dr. Harold Smith's learned and scholarly work. For the benefit of those who missed the appearance of the first volume, we may state that his method is to take the narratives of the Gospels in order, grouping them together where parallel, and give concisely the comments on successive passages collected from the various ante-Nicene writers. This volume will be of special interest to many, because it covers the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer. It is a work that cannot be passed over by any student of the Gospels. Few would have the time or opportunity to collect this material for themselves, and yet on many points it is not safe to neglect it. Without committing ourselves to an indiscriminate reverence for the opinions of the Early Fathers, we need to remember that their mind is in many respects closer to that of the New Testament writers than our own, and that those who wrote in Greek had the advantage of commenting on their own tongue. To ignore or depreciate them, because they belong in critical outlook to their own age and not to ours, is foolish and unscientific. We are grateful to Dr. Smith for his labours, and to the S.P.C.K. for making them available to us in an attractive form at a reasonable price.

E. J. BICKNELL.

BAR-HEBRÆUS; COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPELS. Syriac Text, edited and translated by W. E. W. Carr, B.D. S.P.C.K. 21s.

This is a volume which is welcome for several reasons. Students of Syriac often have a certain amount of difficulty in procuring texts to read, and after they have passed beyond the New Testament and some of the ancient Fathers, are often hard put to it to find further material for their studies. In the second place Bar-Hebræus is, perhaps, the greatest figure in the mediæval Syrian Church, and anything of his is worth consideration. Some parts of the present work appear in print for the first time. Editions of the Commentaries on St. Matthew, St. Luke and St. John have already been published in Germany, but there is no other edition of St. Mark at all, and none of the Gospels has been published hitherto in Great Britain. Finally, the work has been very well done.

Mr. Carr has given a great deal more than a bare text and translation. The long introduction contains valuable summaries of Bar-Hebræus' life, writings and theological position, together with some notes on the Syriac language and versions of Scripture. This last point is particularly important, because Bar-Hebræus, a scholar of the first rank, was interested in comparing the texts of various versions in his own tongue, and, while he makes the Peshitta the basis of his Commentary, he constantly cites variants in two other versions, the "Greek" and the Harcleian. The former is probably the Philoxenian, for some of the variants are such as could have arisen only in Syriac, not in Greek.

The translation is a good one of the normal type, and is much easier to read than the Syriac text. Bar-Hebræus is constantly interrupting the flow of his language to interpose notes on grammar and text. These digressions are indicated in the English translation by abbreviations, parentheses and italics, but the whole runs straight on in the Syriac;

which gives the reader rather a " jerky " effect. Could this difficulty have been avoided by the use of brackets ? An interesting feature of the book is that Mr. Carr set up the Syriac type with his own hands, and though this has not saved him altogether from misprints, he is to be congratulated on the success of this and other features of his work.

T. H. Robinson.

Sukkah, Mishna and Tosefta. By A. W. Greenup, D.D. S.P.C.K. 5s.

The Feast of Tabernacles has received a good deal of attention in recent years, and we have had new but entirely different theories of its origin from two of the most brilliant European scholars, Mowinckel and Gressmann. This volume, then, is particularly opportune, for, though it throws no light on the source and original significance of the festival, it helps us to understand the later procedure, including some features which are not mentioned in the Levitical law, but yet are certainly ancient. The book appears amongst the *Translations from Early Documents*, and is the fourth Mishna tract to be published in that useful little series. A few years ago Dr. Greenup published the Hebrew text with the S.P.C.K. (we believe that for the Tosefta it was the English *editio princeps*), and many students who find Rabbinic Hebrew difficult will welcome the English translation.

Dr. Greenup is one of that small band of British Christian scholars who have made themselves real experts in Rabbinic literature, and the book is what we should expect from his reputation. The twenty-six pages of Introduction are full of useful material, and the translation is at once clear and sound. Not the least valuable part of the work is to be found in the Notes, which supply a great deal of information which the reader will be glad to have, and illustrate the writer's wide knowledge of Rabbinic Judaism.

An important feature both of this and of the Hebrew text of Dr. Greenup is the presence of the Tosefta. This is an element in the Talmud which is known to comparatively few English students, and while it cannot claim the authority or importance of the Mishna itself, it forms a very interesting appendix to the earlier tradition. We must count Dr. Greenup amongst those who are to-day giving us most light on the actual Judaism of the first two centuries A.D.

T. H. Robinson.

Nestorius, The Bazaar of Heracleides.* Oxford University Press. 21s.

The problem of the orthodoxy of Nestorius was raised in an acute form by the publication in 1908 of Dr. Bethune Baker's fresh examinations of the evidence in the light of a newly recovered *Apology* by Nestorius himself. The Syriac text of this, together with a French translation, published in 1910, made it possible for students to examine the question afresh and led to a very interesting discussion. The Clarendon Press has now issued an English translation of the Apology, edited by G. R. Driver and Leonard Hodgson, based on an independent study of the surviving Syriac version of the sixth century. This translation, with Introduction, Notes and Appendices, should enable a larger circle of students of Christian doctrine to join in the debate on the question whether Nestorius was a Nestorian, and to traverse a fascinating and instructive field of Christological speculation.

* This preliminary notice will be followed by a fuller review later.—Ed.

THE LIVES OF THE SAINTS. Originally compiled by the Rev. Alban Butler, now edited, revised and copiously supplemented by Herbert Thurston, S.J. Vol. I. January. Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. 1926. 7s. 6d.

Even so modern a writer as Joseph Conrad acutely and sympathetically says of legends that they "spring from a noble soil, they are a form of memory which we all of us like to leave behind us, that lingers about the achievements of men who have had their day, and the vanished forms of things which have served the needs of their time."

In noticing a greatly revised edition, the duty of a reviewer is not so much to estimate its literary style and value, nor even its scholarship, for which the names of Butler and Thurston are sufficient guarantees, though these points will be touched upon; but rather to deal with those dull facts which enable a reader of the review to judge whether the new edition is a necessity to replace the old, and, secondly, what are the main lines upon which changes are made, and with what perspicacity of judgment that is done.

There can be no question whatever as to the answer to the first of these questions. This is very largely a new book, and most emphatically no library can possibly afford to make the possession of an older edition an excuse for doing without this; while the wise judgment and selective wisdom of the present editor will be sufficiently manifested by the facts stated below.

For purposes of comparison we have chosen, out of the vast number of editions of Butler which even his editor does not attempt to enumerate, the "original stereotype edition" in 12 volumes, published in 1854—that is, exactly a century after Butler first began publication, though we notice that Thurston places that event two years later than our edition states. As regards additions we note that the January volume in 1854 contained 156 titles, the present edition contains 268, of which 151 are marked as new, or "almost entirely rewritten." The editor estimates that on the same scale the work will, despite much severe pruning of the old text, amount to at least 3,000 notices (as against 1,800 in "the more complete posthumous editions"), and we fancy that this is more likely to increase rather than be cut down as the work progresses.

The additions are planned to include all recently beatified, though they are by no means confined to those—*e.g.*, one is St. Felix of Bourges (*c.* 580). The Preface happily contains a clear, though brief, explanation of the process of beatification as distinct from a mere *confirmatio cultus*, such as that of "the English martyrs."

The rewritten articles gain greatly in historicity, even if they lose in picturesqueness, as may be seen in comparing such typical ones as St. Isidore (which occurs on p. 193 of the 1854 edition, but is reached by p. 189 in Thurston) or S. Ælred, Abbot of Rievaulx, Yorks (p. 171, 1854; p. 154, Thurston), where, as elsewhere, the language is modernized and even, as it seems to us, unnecessarily varied.

The latter article adds an excerpt from the *Life* by Walter Daniel "only recently discovered," which may serve as an example of the kind of editing which marks a real and scholarly knowledge of what an editor's duties and prerogatives are. The pagings noted above show, on the other hand, how severely the old matter has been cut down to admit the additions.

Another example of an article that would naturally be rewritten is that on St. Peter's Chair at Rome. Here, as the progress of the controversy on the papal claims would lead us to expect from an honest protagonist, many of the "authorities" quoted by Butler (including Eusebius) disappear, while, on the other hand, Edmundson's *Bampton Lectures* are seized on with avidity and quoted with much effect.

As regards omissions, we have noted in this volume twenty-one such, of which none are any real loss, except three that we may hope may only be deferred to other months to bring their dates into accordance with the present-day Roman calendar. These are St. Nennius, St. Cyril of Alexandria, and St. Serapion, the interesting Englishman who (1240) attempted the redemption of English captives from the "Barbary pirates."

As distinguished from Dictionaries of Biography which cover the same ground (or much of it), the present editor has concentrated upon the spiritual and devotional purpose of the *Lives* as his original author did, and, as would be expected, is also more tolerant of legendary lore.

W. C. Piercy.

The Origin of Islam in its Christian Environment. By Richard Bell. Macmillan. 10s. 6d.

Mr. Bell has been hampered in his work by the limitation his title implies. He is not unmindful of the influence of Judaism on Islam; but he has only been able to discuss it incidentally, and thus the thesis loses proportion.

He describes the condition of Christianity in and around Arabia, the thought of the society in which Muhammad may be presumed to have lived, and the growth of Muhammad's religious knowledge. He carries on the story of Islam's debt to Christianity into Abbasid times.

We could wish that Mr. Bell had developed some of the arguments on which he bases his conclusions as to the course of Muhammad's knowledge of Jewish and Christian teaching. We have difficulty in believing that at the Hijra Muhammad did not realize that Jews and Christians were separate communities. The reader is likely to overestimate the influence of Christianity in the days of the Caliphs, unless he is aware of Jewish priority in certain fields—*e.g.*, the Eternal Word (adopted by Islam in reference to the Quran and to Muhammad) is originally Jewish in conception.

Mr. Bell describes clearly the sufferings of Christians in the Eastern Empire and under the Persians, and shows clearly how economic pressure brought about wholesale "conversions" to Islam. His explanation of the word *furqan* is lucid and happy, and might well serve as a model in the investigation of the meaning of Aramaic words embedded in Arabic.

Alfred Guillaume.

Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary. Together with a Preliminary Essay on Deutero-Isaiah's Influence on Jewish Thought. By Reuben Levy, M.A. Oxford University Press. 10s.

Mr. Levy claims that justification for his addition to the vast literature on the Deutero-Isaiah lies "mainly in the fact that it has made use of . . .

Rabbinical commentators." The chief interest of this book lies in the author's clear sketch of the influence wielded by the unknown prophet on Jewish thought in the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, the early Rabbinical writings, and post-Talmudic works.

Here Mr. Levy has served the cause of scholarship and religion. He demonstrates the great effort Jews put out to bring the knowledge of God to the Gentiles in the long period between the Fall of Babylon and the Fall of Jerusalem.

It is to be hoped that many will read the translations of the sayings of the Jewish doctors, which show that they were often men full of zeal for the souls of the heathen. It says much for their charity and piety that the making of proselytes went on for some centuries after the fall of the Jewish state. "God's sole purpose in exiling Israel among the nations was in order that they might be increased by proselytes. For Scripture says: 'I sow them among the nations.'" Again: "A heathen who carries out the Torah is as the High Priest." Mr. Levy quotes *Megilla* 10*b* to illustrate the doctrine of God's regard even for Israel's enemies. The ministering angels wished to sing in triumph over the drowning of Pharaoh's host, and God replies: "The creatures of my hands have been sunk in the sea, and do you wish to sing songs!"

Only the most sanguine would expect to find much that is new in a commentary on the Deutero-Isaiah, and Mr. Levy has little to offer us here. His attempt to equate '*uth* in l. 4 with the Arabic *ghatta* is unhappy, and his conjectural restoration of the Hebrew of liii. 10 has no support in Hebrew usage. The statement that the prophets were interpreters of the law needs some qualification. But these are small blemishes, and need not blind the reader to the merits of the book.

ALFRED GUILLAUME.

APPLIED RELIGION. By the Right Rev. J. P. Maud, D.D., Bishop of Kensington. Longmans. 2s. 6d.

This book consists of ten addresses originally delivered at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields. They deal in a practical way with the most pressing problems of modern life, and especially with the materialism which is so much in evidence to-day. To meet these difficulties we need to make God real to men by the power of the Holy Spirit, and by the following of Christ. Christ came to transform life, and to establish the Kingdom of God upon earth. He healed sickness. He cast out fear. He enlightened men's minds. In the latter part of the book the Bishop applies the teaching of Christ to social life, married life, and business. The concluding address deals with Christ's peace in the heart, and the call to Christians to be peacemakers. No doubt in reading addresses originally spoken we lose something. But they were well worth publishing and "sending out to a wider public." They are deeply spiritual. Often they throw fresh light on the New Testament. Always they are shot through and through with love and devotion to the Master. Their aim may be summed up in words from the ninth address: "Jesus Christ meant His principles to apply to every department of human life. The Church's function is to show society how to be Christian."

H. W. FULFORD.

ASSENT TO THE ARTICLES. By W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, D.D. S.P.C.K. 8s.

This valuable little book deals in a comprehensive fashion with the problem of what exactly is implied by Assent to the Thirty-nine Articles. It sketches the history of subscription to these Articles, and so gives a catena of the views of the leading authorities in the Church in ancient and modern times as to the nature of such assent. Starting from the Canons of 1604 and the Declaration of Charles I. prefixed to them, the author quotes the views of Bramhall, Hall, Burnet, and others, including Bishop Gibson (late of Gloucester), and the recently published *Liberal Evangelicalism*, and then sums up the results of his investigation, laying stress on the relation of the Articles to the Creeds. The Articles are a document of a local Church; the Creeds documents of the Church universal. He points out (*a*) that the assent of the laity is not required to the Articles, and (*b*) that the form of assent was considerably modified in 1865. Assent means no more than a *general* agreement, and pledges no one to approval of details. The book is conspicuous for its scrupulous fairness and the clearness with which its arguments and conclusions are set out.

H. W. FULFORD.

BOOK NOTES

St. Joan of Arc : a Study of the Supernatural in her Life and Mission. By Justin Rousseil. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 6s. This very interesting book well deserved its admirable translation into English. It is not a Life of the Saint; indeed, it presupposes that the reader is familiar with the facts. Rather it is a polemical treatise against those writers who attempt to explain St. Joan's career without recourse to the supernatural. The writer says of Anatole France's book: "M. France's book appeared in 1909, and was eagerly read by thousands. May we see in the Great War of 1914-1919, which devastated our country, and from which we shall not recover for a generation, the punishment of Heaven for the guilty welcome it received ?" (p. 68). But the hitting, if hard, is fair. The general conclusion is not likely to be disputed by our readers: "The life of Joan of Arc without any miracle would itself be the most astounding of miracles" (p. 113). M. Rousseil devotes much space to proving the reality of St. Joan's visions. On p. 86 he says there was no image of St. Michael in the Church at Domrémy. On p. 99: "Besides the statue of St. Michael, *if it were there* (which is doubtful) . . ."

Berkeley William Randolph. A Memoir. By C. J. Smith. Mowbray. 4s. A far wider circle than that of old Ely men will enjoy this book. On Canon Randolph fell the mantle of Bishop King, and his influence on the English Church was very great. An appreciation of his life and work appeared in THEOLOGY of May, 1925.

The Hallowing of Work. By Francis Paget, D.D. S.C.M. 1s. 3d. This address is now obtainable in pamphlet form.

How Readest Thou ? By Stephen Neill. S.C.M. 2s. 6d., paper cover; 4s., cloth boards. The sub-title is "A Simple Introduction to the New Testament." We can hardly have too many helps to the reading of the Bible. This is intended mainly for boys, according to the Preface; if we add the word "sixth-form," a good idea of its scope will be gained. The book is really simple; in places a little simple in another sense, as if Mr, Neill had not realized the complexities of his subject. It is thoroughly

orthodox and reverent, also very clear and readable. The book would have been improved by careful editing. Thus Mr. Neill puts the crucifixion on Thursday, following a strange theory of Westcott's which has found no supporters.

Eleven Christians. S.C.M. 5s. To this book eleven Wesleyan Methodists, belonging to a Society called "The Fellowship of the Kingdom," contribute each one "study in personality." The subjects chosen are Clement of Alexandria, St. Augustine, Gerard Groote, St. Theresa, Pascal, Bunyan, George Fox, J. H. Newman, W. E. Gladstone, Bishop Francis Paget, and (the only Methodist) James Smetham. All write in a Catholic spirit and an agreeable style, and their essays should be most helpful in enlarging the horizon of the laity.

Sacramentals. By Marcus Donovan. With a Foreword by Arnold Pinchard. Society of SS. Peter and Paul. 6s. This is a readable series of seventeen chapters on certain "pious practices akin to the Sacraments," such as the making of the Sign of the Cross and the recitation of the Angelus. Ten pages in favour of extra-liturgical devotions come between similar chapters on Vestments and the Ornaments of the Church and Minister. Quotations abound on almost every page, but there seems little discrimination in the value of sources. Disraeli's *Curiosities of Literature* provides material equally with the works of Frere, Feasey, and Fortescue. But the book makes no pretence to exact scholarship, witness perhaps the manifest "howler" in the short Latin dedication to the late Fr. Le Couteur.

New Appreciations of George Fox: a Tercentenary Collection of Studies. Foreword by J. Rendel Harris. Swarthmore Press. 6s. This reprint of articles and notices from very diverse magazines and newspapers may be cordially welcomed. After three centuries fluctuating opinion about George Fox has settled into a chorus of approval. Increased knowledge, the growth of the spirit of toleration, and the development of psychology have contributed to this change, so that now we find the *Hibbert Journal* and the *Guardian*, the Dean of St. Paul's, and the former editor of the *Spectator*, almost at one in their estimate of the founder of "Quakerism." As an introduction to the study of Fox this book will be found most valuable, and the excellent select bibliography which is given at the end provides the student with all the necessary signposts on the road to fuller knowledge.

The Work of an Evangelist. By the Rev. Charles C. Bell. Mowbray. 3s. 6d. The well-known Canon and Missioner of York has put together nine chapters on Parochial Missions, Conventions, and Retreats. As might be expected from such an experienced missioner, they are full of sound sense and practical advice, and cannot fail to be helpful to anyone engaged in evangelistic work. The section on Mission Literature is particularly useful with its sensible comments on "Advertisement," and we are particularly glad to read the missioner's words on "Hymns" with their wholesome conclusion that "surely obscurantism in hymns is as bad as obscurantism in sermons."

The Fourfold Challenge of To-day. Edited by Henry Cecil. Longmans. 2s. 6d. This little book is a fairly full report of the Proceedings of the Sheffield Regional Copec Conference in October, 1924. Briefly the Challenge is concerned with the questions of Education, Housing, Industrial conditions, and World-Peace. No one will agree with everything that was said: that is not to be expected. But every page of this report bears

witness to the freshness of outlook and the sincerity of conviction of the various speakers. The sermons delivered during the three days of the conferences are printed apparently verbatim. Amongst them, that on Jonah and Nineveh, by the Rev. E. Shillito, seems to us especially good.

The Mystic Flock. By Sidney R. Griggs. Wells Gardner. 3s. 6d. This study in the Interior Life is from the pen of a Priest in the Diocese of Bloemfontein, and is recommended in a characteristic Preface by the Bishop of that diocese, Walter Carey. The meditations on the familiar threefold way of Purification, Illumination, and Union are based on an analysis of the "Good Shepherd" passage in the tenth chapter of St. John. Though there is nothing very new in this little book, the devout learner will find both help and profit in its pages.

A Study of the Mind of Christ. By David Jenks. S.C.M. 4s. 6d. As those who know other books by Fr. Jenks will expect, this latest little work of his is deeply spiritual, fresh in outlook, suggestive of new lines of thought. Its thesis is that lives which we agree in describing as Christ-like are not merely due to the imitation of Christ. "They go deeper than imitation. They have drunk of the spirit of Christ: He is showing forth Himself in them." Putting on one side for his purpose the truth that the mind of Christ is centred in love, Fr. Jenks takes the ground that that mind may be expressed in terms of "the glory of God," and expounds the content of this phrase in five most moving chapters. He deals with it as revealed in the Old and New Testament, in the Church and in the Individual. There is in these days, one is sometimes tempted to think, too ready a tendency to produce and to rely upon small devotional books. This is a small book of some 150 pages of matter. But to anyone in search of a really good book for Lenten (or other) reading this sane, stimulating, and practical study may be whole-heartedly commended.

The Faculty of Communion. By Edith Lyttelton. Longmans. 4s. 6d. Mrs. Lyttelton admits no doubt at all of the reality of communication between the living and the dead. Discarnate intelligences who once were dear to us upon this earthly plane are ever seeking to help and console us if we will but try to meet them. Unless one is willing to entertain this point of view the book must be largely meaningless. It is a plea—reasoned, restrained and deeply sincere—for recognition and encouragement by the Churches of this quasi-mystical faculty of pure spiritual intercourse. The writer in no way weakens her case by frankly conceding that certain dangers may attend the attempt to exercise this faculty. The safeguard is an attitude of humble, serene and selfless love for the dead friend whose presence and companionship are being sought. It is difficult to resist the claim that such communion, if and when it can be attained, makes for spiritual progress, and brings a renewed and heightened sense of the infinite mercies of God. This little book is written by one who would no doubt be the first to admit that she is an amateur in theology or philosophy. We may therefore overlook some singular statements—*e.g.*, "Dogmatic, almost physical, knowledge of God is not attainable on this plane," or that dogmas are "perfect objects of faith."

The Unwritten Gospel. By Roderic Dunkerley. Allen and Unwin. 8s. 6d. Patristic quotations, apocryphal gospels, Oxyrhynchus papyri, Moslem writings, and even the tenth-century Blickling Homilies have been ransacked in this recent attempt to gather up the fragments that may remain of the Dicta Christi. Certainly this is a painstaking, accurate, and comprehensive work which may be cordially recommended to anyone in

search of a good introduction to the subject. We think the author underestimates the amount of attention which has been given to the Agrapha. The bibliography of the subject in Pick's Paralipomena runs to 26 octavo pages, and that useful work appeared eighteen years ago, and since then many other books and articles have been published. The main *differentia* of Mr. Dunkerley's book is, in his own words, that "the passages are gathered into groups representing different periods of the life of Jesus or aspects of His ministry, and are threaded together by descriptive comment in such a way as to tell a consecutive story." The result may be satisfactory to the general reader, but obviously it is achieved by imagination rather than historic fact.

A. E. S.

The Bible as Missionary Handbook. By Henry A. Lapham. Heffer. 4s. 6d. A series of lectures given at a Nonconformist missionary training college. A posthumous work, and for that reason not quite complete. The author traces four stages in the religious condition of the Jews—Animism, Polytheism, Humanism, Legalism—and shows in a very interesting way how these correspond to the four types of non-Christian religion. Of these, Animism is to be found everywhere, Polytheism in the Hindus, Humanism in the Buddhists and Confucianists, Legalism in the Mohammedans. There is a curious statement on p. 120 that our Lord taught that Sabbaths and fastings were detrimental to spirituality, and, as is natural, we are conscious of a certain bias against Catholicism; but the line of thought is very suggestive.

The Uniats and Their Rites. Alcuin Club Publication. Mowbray. 2s. This is a paper written for the Alcuin Club, and is slight in character. It concludes, as is natural, with a plea for the clothing of the Anglican rite with the ancient rather than the modern ceremonial. It is beautifully illustrated, but, curiously enough, the pictures of the Syrian Melkite ecclesiastics suggest that they buy their vestments at the most Latin Church furnishers they can find.

K. D. M.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER